DISPLAY
WITHDRAWN FROM
O.S.U. LIBRARY
Unbound issue
Does not circulate

JUNE 1994
$3.00/£2.00

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

THE TRIUMPH OF FINANCIAL CAPITAL

Paul M. Sweezy

POST-NAFTA POLITICS: LEARNING FROM ASIA

Martin Hart-Landsberg

THE STORY OF WHY I AM HERE: OR, A WOMAN CONNECTS OPPRESSIONS

Alice Walker

VOL. 46

2

Also inside the Philipp reviews a and more

Property of
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Library Serials
Corvallis, OR 97331-4503

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME 46 NUMBER 2 JUNE 1994

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Triumph of Financial Capital
by Paul M. Sweezy 1

POST-NAFTA POLITICS: LEARNING FROM ASIA by Martin Hart-Landsberg 12

MILITARY ACCESS: THE PENTAGON VERSUS THE PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION by Daniel B. Schirmer 22

THE STORY OF WHY I AM HERE: OR, A WOMAN CONNECTS OPPRESSIONS by Alice Walker 38

CORRESPONDENCE
Stalinism, Imperialism, and Cuba by Ken Morrison 44

BOOKS
Actions Speak Louder Than Words by Michael D. Yates 46
Recovering America's Radical History by Gerald Meyers 55

MONTHLY REVIEW (ISSN 0027 0520) is a publication of Monthly Review Foundation, a non-profit institution. It is published monthly except July and August, when bimonthly, and copyright © 1994, by Monthly Review. Second-class postage paid at New York, NY and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send all address changes (Form 3579) to Monthly Review Foundation, 122 West 27th Street, New York, NY 10001.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS:
122 West 27th Street, New York, NY 10001. Telephone: (212) 691-2555. Fax: (212) 727-3676
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. *MR* is indexed in the PAIS Bulletin, Historical Abstracts, America: History and Life, Political Science Abstracts, and the Alternative Press Index, P.O. Box 7729, Baltimore, MD 21218, tel.: (301) 243-2471.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTION:
B.De Boer, Inc., 113 E. Centre Street, Nutley, NJ 07110; Armadillo & Co., 5795 W. Washington Boulevard, Culver City, CA 90232; Small Changes, 3443 Twelfth Avenue West, Seattle, WA 98119; Le Dernier Mot, 3968 St. Lawrence Boulevard, Montreal, Quebec H2W 1Y4, Canada; Central Books, 99 Wallis Road, London, E9 5LN, England.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:
U.S.: One year $25, students and senior citizens $20; Foreign $29; students and senior citizens $25.
Libraries and Institutions: U.S. $45; Foreign $48.
Additional Postage: First Class (U.S. and Canada $15); Airmail: Foreign $20.

EDITORS: Paul M. Sweezy Harry Magdoff Leo Huberman (1903-1968)
Associate Editor: W.H. Locke Anderson Assistant Editor: John C. Antush Circulation Manager: Martin Paddio

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

The health-care "industry" and hence the health-care problem in the United States is undergoing a very rapid change. What is happening in this sector of the economy is comparable to the movement of concentration and centralization that took place in the late nineteenth century in manufacturing—briefly analyzed in this month's Review of the Month. But there is one big difference: what was spread over several years a hundred years ago is now happening in a matter of months. Doctors and other health-care professionals are being herded into collective-practice institutions like HMOs, and these in turn are being bought up or otherwise taken over by big insurance companies. Traditional not-for-profit hospitals are turning themselves into for-profit businesses, merging, and/or otherwise being absorbed into huge multi-unit hospital corporations. The major pharmaceutical companies, multinational as well as domestic, are heavily involved at various levels in these complicated processes, always trying to expand (or at least protect) their share of some of the most lucrative markets the U.S. economy has to offer. It is getting to the point where no significant player in the health-care game can afford to stay on the sidelines on penalty of being excluded altogether and destroyed. We see here the logic of capital-

(Continued on inside back cover.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRIUMPH OF FINANCIAL CAPITAL

by PAUL M. SWEEZY

The announced subject of this conference is "New Trends in Turkey and the World." I shall not try to say anything about new trends in Turkey, partly because of my ignorance but more importantly because Turkey is very much part of the world, and in this period the mother of all new trends is global in nature. To understand what is happening in any part of the world, one must start from what is happening in the whole world. Never has Hegel's dictum "The Truth is in the Whole" been as true and relevant as it is today.

In an oft-quoted passage written in 1936, John Maynard Keynes said:

> Speculators may do no harm as bubbles on a steady stream of enterprise. But the position is serious when enterprise becomes the bubble on a whirlpool of speculation. When the capital development of a country becomes a by-product of the activities of a casino, the job is likely to be ill-done.

Keynes was presumably alluding to the situation that existed in the late 1920s in the United States, the world's most advanced capitalist country. Today it has the ominous sound of a prophecy that was to be fully realized more than half a century later, in the 1980s and 1990s—not only in the United States but in the whole world.

This article was originally a lecture presented at a conference organized by the Association of Graduates of the Faculty of Economics of the Unversity of Istanbul, Turkey, on April 21, 1994.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Financial capital, once cut loose from its original role as a modest helper of a real economy of production to meet human needs, inevitably becomes speculative capital geared solely to its own self-expansion. In earlier times no one ever dreamed that speculative capital, a phenomenon as old as capitalism itself, could grow to dominate a national economy, let alone the whole world. But it has.

This is the reality we face today. Its dire consequences are visible on all sides, from 35 million unemployed in the advanced industrial countries to deepening poverty and destitution in the Third World and unchecked ecological deterioration everywhere.

What is at issue here and what needs to be explained is how all this came about. Capital accumulation has always been the driving force of the capitalist system and has been treated as such by all the major schools of economic analysis—classical, Marxian, and neoclassical. It has been generally taken for granted that capital accumulation adds to wealth, income, and the standard of living of the countries in which it takes place. There has of course always been another side to the accumulation process—the periodic panics and breakdowns to which it is prone, the unequal benefits conferred on various segments of the population, etc. But on the whole it has been and still is looked upon as a necessary process the positive aspects of which far outweigh the negative.

It is not my present purpose to call this into question as a judgment on the functioning and consequences of capital accumulation seen in the perspective of its centuries-long history. What I do want to argue is that recent changes, mostly occurring since the Second World War, have so modified the modalities of capital accumulation that it has ceased to be on the whole a positive and benign force and instead has turned into a terribly destructive one.

The history of capitalism as we know it today begins with the industrial revolution in the second half of the eighteenth century. The main actors were small enterprises operating in competitive markets. Technological advances, beginning in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and spreading from the textile industries, touched off what soon became a self-reproducing and self-expanding process of accumulation and economic growth. It was this process that was the empirical basis of the first real social science, classical political economy.

In the early stages of industrial capitalism markets were still largely local, a fact that not only limited their size but also acted as a restraint on the competitive behavior of the participants. Later on with the development of the means of transportation and communication (canals, steamboats, railroads, telegraphs) markets grew enormously in size, impersonality, and the fierceness of the competition they engendered. By the second half of the nineteenth century, capital accumulation and economic growth had reached a feverish pitch.

From one point of view this was splendid. Capitalism was doing precisely what was expected of it. But from another point of view, that of the profitability of capital, things looked rather different. The trouble was that in industry after industry, capitalists trying to get the better of one another expanded their capacity and production far beyond the point of maximum profit, in many cases beyond the point of any profit at all. Weaker firms fell by the wayside in droves, and even the strongest had to struggle to survive. For the United States, already contending for a leading place in the capitalist world, one figure tells the story. The index of wholesale prices (1910-1914 = 100) stood at 185 at the end of the Civil War in 1865. By 1890 it had fallen to 82, a decline of 57 percent in twenty-five years. Both capital and labor were severely squeezed; industrial unrest and violence reached new heights; the economic literature of the period is full of pessimism and dire forebodings.

It was in these circumstances that history took a fateful turn. In all the advanced capitalist countries, the last two decades of the nineteenth century witnessed an intense process of concentration and centralization of capital. Stronger companies gobbled up weaker ones and joined together in various forms of combinations (cartels, trusts, holding com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

panies, giant corporations) aimed at eliminating cut-throat competition and getting control of their price and output policies. It was in this period too that the capitalists of the core countries, eagerly seeking new markets and cheaper sources of raw materials, reached out to colonize or otherwise gain control of the weaker countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. By the turn of the twentieth century what had been the small-scale, predominantly domestically oriented capitalism of the nineteenth century became the monopolistically controlled imperialist system of the twentieth.

It is important to understand the role of finance in this historic transformation. Up until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, banks and other dealers in money capital had two main functions: on the one hand providing the short-term credit needed to keep the wheels of industry and trade turning, and on the other hand catering to the long-term requirements of governments (especially for raising armies and waging wars), utilities whether private or public (canals, railroads, waterworks, etc.), and large insurance companies. After the Civil War (1861-1865), in the financing and provisioning of which many fortunes had been made, many capitalists turned their attention increasingly to industry and became prime movers in the whole concentration process, often winding up owning or controlling vast holdings in what would later come to be called the commanding heights of the economy. In all this the career of J.P. Morgan, America's most famous financier, became paradigmatic in a way that rarely occurs in the case of a single individual. I should also mention the extensive literature, both analytical and artistic, that was stimulated by capitalism's historic transformation. Three outstanding examples come to mind: in the United States, Thorstein Veblen's *The Theory of Business Enterprise* (1904); in Germany, Rudolf Hilferding's *Das Finanzkapital* (1910); and in Russia, Lenin's *Imperialism* (1917).

From our present point of view, that of new global trends at the end of the twentieth century, it is important to understand that what happened a hundred years ago set the stage

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the ultimate triumph of financial capital but fell short of that outcome. During the first half of the twentieth century the capital accumulation process continued to be focused on *industrial* capital, as it had been from the beginning of the industrial revolution. Financiers played a greater role as partners, and frequently dominant partners, of industrial capitalists. The two groups shared the goal of maximizing the profits of productive capital (steel, oil, chemicals, utilities, paper, etc.) however much they may have fought over the division of the spoils. There were of course specialists like commercial bankers, stock brokers, and bond dealers who lived in a financial world where speculation was always a temptation and on occasion, as throughout the history of capitalism, could take on a life of its own involving wide segments of society with disastrous results for many. But on the whole finance was still subordinate to production.

In the capital accumulation process itself a significant change took place in the early years of the twentieth century following the stormy period of concentration and centralization that had preceded. Wholesale prices which, as noted earlier, had been falling since the Civil War, turned up with the cyclical upturn of the mid-nineties and thereafter continued on a rising trend (with a big bulge in the First World War) into the 1920s. The obverse of this price movement was a slowdown in capital investment as the newly emergent oligopolistic corporations learned how to adjust their production policies to the absorptive capacity of their markets. Historians of this period have generally noted that the decade before the war was sluggish, with a rising level of unemployment and unusually long downturns and short upturns.

In retrospect it seems clear that the beginning of the twentieth century was also the beginning of a long period of stagnation like that which actually characterized the 1930s. What prevented this from happening sooner was the First World War. After that came an aftermath boom which in turn was sustained by a number of special factors, most notably the first surge of the automobile revolution with its ripple effects.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But deep-seated depressive forces had been implanted in the capitalist economy during the transformation of the late nineteenth century, and it was only a matter of time before they would rise to the surface as the dominant factor in the system's functioning. This finally came to pass as the spectacular financial crash of 1929 gradually gave way to the Great Depression of the 1930s.

The Great Depression was something new in the history of capitalism, a whole decade in which there was no growth at all: the capital accumulation process simply came to a halt. In the United States, by then the leading capitalist country, unemployment reached 25 percent of the labor force in 1933. A cyclical upturn which most economists, judging from past experience, expected would lead to full employment, stalled with the unemployment rate still at 14 percent in 1937. There followed a recession within the depression. Joblessness shot up to 19 percent in 1938, and the decade seemed destined to end with not only the economy but the whole society in a profound crisis. Roosevelt's New Deal which had introduced long overdue reforms and saved millions from starvation through emergency relief programs, was losing support and for the first time in U.S. history the future of capitalism itself began to be seriously questioned.

What brought this period to a close of course was the Second World War. As John Kenneth Galbraith so aptly expressed it, the Great Depression never ended, it just merged into the war economy. In the five years 1939-1944 the country's Gross National Product increased by some 75 percent and unemployment practically disappeared. But that was not part of the internal logic of the capitalist system. That logic had been exposed in its purest form in the Great Depression: the normal condition of the mature capitalist system is stagnation. To the extent that this is not the actual state of the advanced capitalist countries, the explanation has to be sought in external, non-economic forces.

For about a quarter of a century after the Second World War, i.e., from the mid-1940s to the 1970s, these external

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forces were in ample supply: repairing war damage, making up for shortages caused by wartime diversion of resources from civilian production, taking advantage of technologies developed for military purposes such as electronics and jet planes, above all a new round of wars, hot and cold. During two decades, the 1950s and 1960s, the conditions for capital accumulation were extremely favorable. Capitalism entered a new golden age, reminiscent of the best years of its youth. But this could not and did not last for long. It is the nature of accumulation to eliminate the demand that stimulates it. And unless new stimuli emerge, the process subsides, and the tendency to stagnation takes over. This is what was beginning to happen as the 1960s drew to a close, culminating in the sharp recession of 1974-1975, by far the most serious since the end of the Second World War.

A new stimulus was badly needed, and it emerged in a form which, while certainly unanticipated, was nevertheless a logical outcome of well established tendencies within the global capitalist economy.

I must interrupt the story here by confessing that the territory we are about to enter, if not exactly unknown, is in large part unexplored and very inadequately mapped—in addition to which I am not particularly well qualified by training or experience to play the role of explorer. Still the subject is so important that anything that stimulates interest and debate may prove to be useful.

What I am talking about is the development in the last twenty years or so of a relatively independent—relative, that is, to what went before—financial superstructure sitting on top of the world economy and most of its national units. It is made up of banks—central, regional, and local— and a host of dealers in a bewildering variety of financial assets and services, all interconnected by a network of markets, some of which are structured and regulated, others informal and unregulated. Such an entity is multi-dimensional, and there is no conceptual unit that could be used to measure its size. But that it is very large and growing is not only intuitively

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evident but clearly reflected in statistics that relate to important measurable aspects of the whole.

I said that this financial superstructure has been the creation of the last two decades. This means that its emergence was roughly contemporaneous with the return of the stagnation in the 1970s. But doesn't that fly in the face of all previous experience? Traditionally financial expansion has gone hand-in-hand with prosperity in the real economy. Is it really possible that this is no longer true, that now in the late twentieth century the opposite is more nearly the case: in other words, that now financial expansion feeds not on a healthy real economy but on a stagnant one?

The answer to this question, I think, is yes it is possible, and it has been happening. And I will add that I am quite convinced that the inverted relation between the financial and the real is the key to understanding the new trends in the world with which this conference is concerned.

I would like to be able to explain all this in simple, understandable terms. But I can't and not only for lack of time. These are very complicated problems, and I know of no one who has come up with satisfactory solutions. Mainstream economists for the most part simply deny their existence and in so doing, in my opinion, lose touch with reality. All I can do is try to suggest the underlying logic of the argument.

The real economy, the one that produces goods and services that enable people to live and reproduce, is owned by a tiny minority of oligopolists. It is structured to yield them large profits, far beyond what they could or would even want to consume. Being capitalists, they want to invest most of their profits. But the very same structure that yields these profits puts strict limits on the incomes of the underlying population. They can just barely buy the current level of output offered to them at prices calculated to yield the going rate of oligopoly profit. There is therefore no profit to be made from expanding the capacity to produce the goods that enter into mass consumption. To do so would be to invest in excess capacity,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a patent capitalist irrationality. What, then, are they to do with their profits?

In retrospect the answer seems obvious: they should invest in financial, not real productive assets. And that, I think, is just what they began to do on an increasing scale as the economy sank once again into stagnation in the 1970s. On the supply side, too, the situation was ripe for change. Financial activity, mostly of a traditional kind, had been stimulated by the postwar boom of the 1950s and 1960s, suffering something of a letdown with the return of stagnation. Financiers were therefore looking for new business. Capital migrating out of the real economy was happily received in the financial sector. Thus began the process which during the next two decades resulted in the triumph of financial capital.

* * *

When I started preparing for this talk, I had grandiose notions about what I wanted to include. First would come a statement of the central theme, the rise to dominance of financial capital; next, a sketch, both historical and analytical, of the origins and development of this process; finally, and most important, thoughts on the implications for understanding what is happening in the world and what to expect as we look forward to the future. I even thought I might find time to say something about what could or should be done by those of us who are not happy with the way things are going.

Alas for illusions. I soon realized that trying to deal with such an agenda in one short talk could only result in hopeless superficiality. So I was obliged to cut back and focus on the historical aspect. But I don't want to end without at least a few notes on implications.

(1) The locus of economic and political power has shifted along with the ascendancy of financial capital. It has long been taken for granted, especially among radicals, that the seat of power in capitalist society was in the boardrooms of a few hundred giant multinational corporations. While

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is no doubt about the role of these entities in the allocation of resources and other significant matters as well, I think there is an added consideration that needs to be stressed. The occupants of these boardrooms are themselves to an increasing extent constrained and controlled by financial capital as it operates through the global network of financial markets. In other words, real power is not so much in corporate boardrooms as in the financial markets. Here a footnote: the giant corporations are also major players in these markets and help to give them their importance. It looks as though Adam Smith's invisible hand is staging a comeback in a new form and with increased muscle.

(2) What holds for corporate CEOs also holds for the wielders of political power. More and more, they too are controlled in what they can and cannot do by the financial markets. This is pretty obvious with respect to the economically weaker members of the international community, most of which are directly under the thumb of the IMF and the World Bank. But it is hardly less true of the stronger members, including the United States. Everything of consequence undertaken by the Clinton administration, from fiscal policy to healthcare reform, must pass the test of acceptability to the financial markets. Just a couple of weeks ago the *New York Times* ran a long story by one of its top reporters entitled "Stock Market Diplomacy" with a subhead "Clinton's Foreign Policy Includes a Regard for How a Move Plays in Global Trading." As far as the intermediate powers are concerned, those that are between the weaker and the stronger, one need only point to the experience of France in the early 1980s. The French people elected a socialist government by an impressive majority. The new government, responding to the electorate, embarked on a course of mild social reforms and fiscal expansion. The result was not long in coming: a severe balance of payments crisis followed by a hasty retreat. As between democracy and financial capital in the world as structured today, there is little doubt about which is the stronger.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3) What is to be done? If my analysis is correct, that neither the global economy, operating under its present rules, nor government constrained to abide by these rules, can deliver what the great majority of the people in the world need—decent jobs, security, livelihood—it seems clear that they have no choice but to challenge the structure itself. I am confident that they will—eventually. The human species is long suffering, but it is not likely that it will tolerate forever what looks like a slide into ungovernability and chaos. Meanwhile, portents of things to come may be visible here and there. I am particularly impressed by the uprising of the poorest peasants in the poorest state of Mexico, a country under a regime that has enthusiastically embraced the brave new world of financial orthodoxy. The Chiapans are not getting ready to seize power, far from it. But they have shaken the whole society to its foundations, and Mexico may never again be what it was before January 1, 1994. Similar things are likely to occur elsewhere. I hope so.

"This is another sad example of the Administration's callous response to a terrible human tragedy. . . . If I were President, I would—in the absence of clear and compelling evidence that they weren't political refugees—give them temporary asylum until we restored the elected government of Haiti."—Democratic Presidential candidate Bill Clinton, responding to President Bush's decision to repatriate fleeing Haitians without screening them for claims of political asylum, May 27, 1992.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POST-NAFTA POLITICS: LEARNING FROM ASIA

by MARTIN HART-LANDSBERG

The recent passage of NAFTA marks another advance in the ongoing TNC (transnational corporate)-led process of North American economic integration, a process which has already shown itself to be destructive of community, the environment, and equality. While the North American corporate community clearly favors this integration, the many anti-NAFTA rallies and demonstrations in Canada, Mexico, and the United States gives strong indication that most working people do not.

Hoping to strengthen and deepen this largely unorganized but strongly felt opposition, progressive activists in all three countries worked hard to take advantage of the NAFTA debate, not only to document the costs associated with this capitalist-led regionalization process, but also to build a popular mass movement capable of defining and struggling for an alternative vision of political, social, and economic life in North America. Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, we were far better at the former than the latter.

So, what next? If we are to effectively build on our recent efforts to create a more democratic and just North America we must, in my opinion, do two things: increase our understanding of this regionalization process and sharpen our strategic thinking concerning movement building. One im-

Martin Hart-Landsberg teaches Economics at Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon. His latest book, *The Rush to Development: Economic Change and Political Struggle in South Korea*, is available for $18.00 from the Monthly Review Press (1993).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portant way to do both is to critically study the experiences of people in other regions who are actively confronting their own TNC-led regionalization process. While activists in this country often take Europe as a point of reference, I have been particularly impressed by the organizing work of Japanese activists, and it is their efforts that I highlight below. A focus on Japan is especially relevant for our work here, since many NAFTA supporters defended the treaty as necessary to keep "ruthless" Japanese competition from destroying our economy.

The Japanese Experience

Transnational corporations have, according to the *UN World Investment Report*, become the "central organizers of economic activities in an increasingly integrated world economy."[1] Most TNC production and investment takes place within the advanced capitalist world, primarily the United States, Japan, and the European Community—what the United Nations calls the Triad—as the world's most powerful corporations fight to establish themselves in each other's home markets.

However, despite this focus on core markets, TNC power has also grown in the Third World.[2] Perhaps most significantly, flows of foreign direct investment into any given Third World (or Central and Eastern European) county are increasingly coming from a single investing country. The result: countries receiving foreign direct investment are being drawn into one of three tightly drawn clusters, each tied to a different Triad power. In short, competition has driven TNCs from each of the three Triad powers to try to build their own "regionally-integrated, independently sustainable networks of overseas affiliates."[3] Corporate survival in the global economy is thus coming to depend upon the relative efficiency of competing regionally-organized production systems.

In many ways, Japanese corporate efforts in this regard have been the most successful. Japan has become Asia's most important investor, trading partner, source of technology,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and provider of foreign aid. More relevant to our discussion here, between 1984 and 1989, Japanese foreign direct investment in East Asia grew five-fold.[4] Even more importantly, the nature of this investment has changed, from raw material extraction to manufacturing and, within manufacturing, from low-technology production to high-technology production. As part of this process, Japanese firms operating in Asia have now been joined by their traditional suppliers, thus reproducing in Asia the same corporate alliance system that dominates the Japanese economy. One consequence of this new, highly-structured regional division of labor is the gradual detachment of Japanese corporations from the Japanese economy.

By the end of the decade, many Japanese activists had come to believe that as a result of this Japanese corporate strategy it was no longer possible to make significant strides towards the creation of a truly democratic, egalitarian, and peaceful Japan (or any other country in the region for that matter), through national struggle alone. Any attempt to shape or restrict corporate activity for purposes of creating better jobs, higher wages, protecting the environment, or securing greater community control over daily life could be blocked by the ability of Japanese corporations to shift their production and wealth from one country to another. Political struggles were, as a result, becoming increasingly defensive in nature, defined more by what seemed possible, than guided by any strategic vision of radical transformation.

What was needed according to this understanding, was the establishment of a regional alliance of workers, farmers, women, the urban poor, environmentalists, indigenous peoples, and peace activists (to mention just some of the key groups), for the purpose of creating both a new vision of the future (built on principles of regional solidarity) and a common struggle for realizing it. And, for such an alliance to succeed, those who were suffering the most from the logic of existing regional and national economic and political structures had to be assured a leading role in the process of creating new ones. Taking up the challenge, a group of Japanese

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

activists issued a call for a People's Plan for the Twenty-First Century (PP21).[5]

The People's Plan for the Twenty-First Century

In 1989, approximately 120,000 Japanese and 280 activists and people's movements leaders from thirty-three other countries (the overwhelming majority from the Asia-Pacific region) met in Japan to participate in the first PP21 gathering. Nineteen different programs, each with a different focus, were held in thirteen different locations over a one month period. There were, for example, separate meetings for workers, farmers, women, indigenous people, and migrant workers, as well as for those concerned with cultural issues, peace and disarmament, and education and human rights. Those attending each meeting were responsible for developing their own statement of purpose, and the gathering as a whole issued a final declaration which attempted to integrate the various concerns and hopes expressed in the individual meetings. This first gathering was judged a success by most participants for many reasons, one of the most basic being that it was the first time that the various regional and national movements and organizations had ever met together to share experiences.

A second PP21 gathering was held in Thailand in 1992, with over 500 people from forty-six different countries in attendance representing various national, regional, and international movements, networks, and NGOs. Once again, there were numerous forums and many workshops. And, as at the first gathering each forum and workshop issued a report, the principles of which were integrated into a final statement. Planning is now underway for the third gathering, scheduled to take place in South Asia sometime in 1995.

These gatherings are not intended to produce either a PP21 organization with its own leaders or a detailed blueprint for an alternative future. Rather, the organizers hope that they will serve as periodic "culminating points," at which time those groups committed to the PP21 process can meet to re-evaluate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and refocus their efforts. Such moments create opportunities for those involved to reconcile differences, strengthen connections, and develop collective responses to problems facing the people of the region.

The PP21 approach to organizing—giving recognition to the ongoing efforts and struggles of already existing groups and giving them primary responsibility for debating, structuring, and organizing their own agenda—has enabled the PP21 process to take shape quickly and democratically. Moreover, it is an honest response to the fact that no one organization can or should create a vision of the future for all people. Those who issued the call for the PP21 hope that by offering activists a broader and trans-border structure within which to work, the end result will be a qualitatively new kind of political movement—one that is decentralized, democratic, and regionally integrated.[6]

In keeping with this thinking, one of the most important concepts being advanced by the PP21 process is that of "trans-border participatory democracy," by which is meant both a goal and a process. In terms of a goal it refers to the creation of a new kind of global democracy. In terms of a process it refers to the rights of people in any one country to directly intervene in the affairs of another country to oppose any actions that might negatively affect them. Such trans-border political action is seen as providing the starting point for creating "trans-border alliances" and eventually a "trans-border people."

Some successes have already been achieved. For example, a PP21 South Asian gathering in late 1993 provided an opportunity for a number of popular groups from Nepal, India, and Bangladesh to meet in Calcutta to discuss common concerns related to the Ganges. The result was an agreement to form "a trans-border people's alliance" to respond to the economic and ecological problems arising from deforestation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japan PP21 Activities

To provide a more complete basis for evaluating the political nature and significance of the PP21, I offer the following brief overview of some recent Japan PP21 activities. Japanese PP21 activists appear to give special attention and support to the struggles of Japanese family farmers and indigenous people. My impression is that this is because they believe that the values expressed by members of these two groups—the importance of community, spirituality, self-sufficiency, respect for nature, etc.—should be at the heart of any new social movement or vision of the future.

More specifically, PP21 activists have helped Japanese organic family farmers strengthen their own networks as well as their ties with several large and progressive Japanese consumer cooperatives. Activists have also organized meetings between women who are part of farming households and women from the urban women's movement to discuss issues related to gender relations in farming communities.

PP21-sponsored activities have also encouraged greater regional contacts among Asian family farmers. Japanese organic farmers have hosted farmers from Thailand and South Korea to discuss organic farming techniques, producer-consumer links, and strategies to defend family farming. Japanese farmers have also visited and worked on farms in Taiwan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Vietnam. Several Japanese consumer coops are also working with agricultural workers in Negros in the Philippines to create a new trade relationship. The coops purchase bananas at higher than market prices to support new initiatives in Negros which involve the picking, packing, and shipping of bananas by worker-controlled enterprises.

The 1989 PP21 gathering helped to expose many Japanese to the struggle being waged by the Ainu people for legal recognition of their indigenous rights (the Ainu are the original natives of Japan). Since then, Japan PP21 activists have worked with Ainu leaders to organize two national speak-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing tours and played a leading role in the formation of a new citizen's group, "*Sisamu*" (meaning neighbors in the Ainu language), which is dedicated to working with the Ainu to restore Ainu rights and create a non-racist Japan.

The PP21 has also inspired a number of new women's initiatives, including the Asian Feminist Art Association which brings together more than 100 feminist artists and movement activists. The Association has sponsored various presentations which often include women from other Asian countries. For example, programs have been developed on the situation of Thai women in Japan which have been shown in both Japan and Thailand. More generally, Japan PP21 activists have given considerable attention to the situation of migrant women in Japan (especially those who are forced to work in Japan's growing sex industry)and to the issue of "women in development" (challenging the logic of Japan's official foreign aid program). This work is seen as part of the larger struggle to build ties between women in Japan and in other Asian countries as well as to challenge patriarchy in Japan.

Another major Japan PP21 initiative involves organizing a common trans-border struggle against the construction of golf courses and other resort facilities on agricultural lands. Many Japanese corporations are buying farm land in Japan to build resorts and golf courses. This has produced local anti-golf course movements led by farmers and environmentalists. Similarly, Japanese corporations are displacing local farmers and fisherpeople in many Southeast Asian countries for the purpose of building tourist facilities. These people are also engaged in resistance. Activists associated with the PP21 movement have organized meetings of members from both campaigns so that the people involved can come to appreciate the common roots of their respective struggles and hopefully develop a more radical and common strategy of resistance.

A final example of PP21-inspired activity: Korean workers have come to Japan several times to press for their rights in struggles against Japanese-owned companies operating in Korea. Japanese workers and PP21 activists have organized

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solidarity activities with these workers, producing several victories and greater solidarity between workers in both countries.[7]

PP21: A Critical Assessment

The PP21 represents a notable effort to promote a popular and democratic movement for social transformation. And, in spite of significant differences in the culture, history, and economic forces shaping Asian and North American regional relationships, there is, I believe, much that we can learn from a careful study of its practice.

In my opinion, the PP21's strengths include:

- its recognition that organizing for change must be carried out through a process that renews our belief in and commitment to creating new ways of living.

- its recognition that, given the nature of global capitalism, this new vision can best be formed as part of a regional dialogue and given expression through coordinated regional action.

- its recognition that Asian activists do not need a new organization but rather a broad structure to help coordinate, integrate, and focus the activities of already existing organizations.

There are also potential weaknesses, however:

- while the decision to create a PP21 structure that draws upon and is in turn shaped by the activities of existing grassroots organizations is very attractive, there is a danger that PP21 gatherings will end up producing a collection of separate demands for change—each generated by and reflecting the interests of different social groups (farmers, workers, women, environmentalists, etc.)—rather than an integrated overall vision of social transformation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

• while Japan PP21's focus on the activities of groups which model new social relations—alternative farming communities, consumer and worker cooperatives, etc.—is understandable given the high priority activists place on encouraging new social visions, such activities do not necessarily form the basis for a strategy of transformation. It is unclear, for example, whether they point the way to the kind of movements we need to strengthen if we are to engage in a direct struggle against existing capitalist organizations and institutions. In fact, there is a danger that such a focus will lead activists to underestimate the importance of encouraging and supporting more innovative forms of traditional class-based political activity, including worker organizing and political education.

• while the PP21's commitment to regional or trans-border organizing is praiseworthy, there is a danger that this commitment may come at the expense of national organizing to challenge national power relations. Trans-border concerns and struggles should not be pitted against national concerns and struggles. Rather, a trans-border vision should inspire and inform national movements for social transformation, which should, in turn, strengthen and be strengthened by trans-border political action. Thus, while national strategies should be developed and refined as part of a trans-border process, national power and national interests continue to be meaningful and the struggle to organize people to challenge and change social systems must still primarily be waged within that framework.

The PP21 provides a challenging reference point for evaluating our own past anti-NAFTA organizing efforts. Among the most important questions still facing our movement: how can we further our own and others' understanding of possible alternatives to the ongoing capitalist-directed regionalization process? To what extent should our own national organizing be informed by regional concerns and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struggles? What organizational structure is most appropriate for coordinating and integrating our own national efforts as well as those of activists through out the region? Unfortunately NAFTA has passed; our work continues.

NOTES

1. UN Center on Transnational Corporations, *World Investment Report 1992: Transnational Corporations as Engines of Growth*, (New York: United Nations, 1992), p. 1.
2. For example, foreign direct investment accounted for approximately 75 percent of all private long term capital flows to the Third World in the 1986-1990 period, compared with only 30 percent in the 1981-1985 period. *Ibid.*, p. 57
3. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
4. "Japan ties up the Asian market," *The Economist*, April 24, 1993, p. 33.
5. The Pacific-Asia Resource Center in Tokyo was one of the initiators of and continues to play a leading role in the PP21. One can learn more about the PP21 and Japan PP21 activities by reading the Center's English language periodical, *AMPO: Japan-Asia Quarterly Review*.
6. The São Paulo Forum, founded in 1990 at a meeting organized by the Workers Party of Brazil, represents an interesting contrast to the gatherings of the PP21. The Forum, which meets annually, brings together a number of left parties and movements from around the Americas, including the Brazilian Workers Party, The Sandinista National Liberation Front of Nicaragua, the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front of El Salvador, the Cuban Communist Party, the Lavalas movement of Haiti, and the Democratic Party of the Revolution of Mexico, to discuss ways of building regional unity and developing collective economic and political strategies for social transformation. The fourth round of the Forum, held in Cuba in July 1993, focused on electoral strategies. For more on the São Paulo Forum see "The Sao Paulo Forum: Is There a New Latin American Left?," by William I. Robinson, *Monthly Review*, December 1992.
7. South Korean workers carried out a similar action in the United States. In 1990, three South Korean union leaders came to the United States to demand justice from Pico Products, a Syracuse, New York, cable TV components manufacturer. The company had shut down its Korean subsidiary, Pico Korea, and fled the country without paying its three hundred workers their back wages and severance pay. After a long and unsuccessful campaign to force the company to pay, the workers tried to use the U.S. legal system to sue the company for violating South Korean labor law. The case was lost, largely because Pico Products was able to convince the court that it was not responsible for the actions of its subsidiary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MILITARY ACCESS: THE PENTAGON VERSUS THE PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTION

by DANIEL B. SCHIRMER

I. The Pentagon: "We Shall Return"

During the Cold War the United States high command stationed sizable numbers of troops in foreign nations on military installations or bases controlled by Washington. Coinciding with the ending of the Cold War the Pentagon began to favor a new form for the expansion of military deployment abroad, the access agreement. This gives the leadership of the U.S. armed forces the right to use the military installations of a foreign government without being responsible for their operation and maintenance and without the permanent deployment of American military personnel. Access agreements therefore conform to post-Cold War conditions facing Washington: they are less of a strain on the U.S. budget and less a target for nationalist resentment in the host countries.

According to *Global Outreach*, a 1992 Congressional study, the U.S. government had made, or was in the process of making, access agreements with some thirty-eight foreign nations. The Reagan and Bush administrations secured most of these and most were with governments of the Third World. But there has been little public notice of this development either in the United States or in the other countries concerned. Perhaps the exception to this has been the Philip-

Daniel B. Schirmer is a specialist on Philippine affairs and a frequent contributor to *Monthly Review*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pines. In 1991 that country's Senate rescinded U.S. base rights as a result of nationalist opposition. Thus when the United States entered into an access arrangement with the Philippines in 1992, in effect reestablishing its military presence in another form, public debate and discussion seemed bound to ensue, and so it did, revealing much about the access policy. For this reason the Philippine experience is exceptionally helpful in understanding this new departure in the U.S. conduct of foreign affairs.

Before he left Manila in November 1993 for a conference with President Clinton, it was reported that Philippine President Fidel Ramos intended to use this meeting to enhance the Philippine-U.S. defense relationship by granting Washington "automatic" access, giving that arrangement the highest degree of utility to the American military. But access in the Philippines, whether automatic or not, is of very dubious constitutional validity. Perhaps that is why President Ramos, on his return to Manila merely declared that he and Clinton had "agreed to strengthen security cooperation between the two countries." Ramos refrained from saying how this was to be done, leaving his assertion empty.

While in the United States, however, Ramos did unquestionably throw light on the essential character of the long-standing Philippine-U.S. security relationship when he described the Philippines as "being in a strategic position for Americans in the Asia-Pacific." As a graduate of West Point and an experienced military officer, the Philippine President knew whereof he spoke.

Because of its location as an island archipelago in the middle of Asia and near the junction of the Pacific and Indian Oceans, the Philippines has served as an unparalleled springboard for the projection of American armed force in the region. This has been the case since the United States first established its military domination of the Philippines when it conquered and colonized that country at the turn of the century. From that time on the terms of what today passes for "security cooperation" have been set by the stronger military

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power, whose special interest has been the country's strategic position.

Although the Filipinos fought a bitter war against the conquest and U.S. imperial policy encountered strong domestic opposition, the U.S. government prevailed. After their defeat of the Philippine resistance U.S. troops remained as a colonial occupying force, and the Philippines took its place as one of the first nations in the Asia-Pacific region on which the U.S. positioned military forces capable of foreign intervention, in what is now called forward deployment. Thus in 1900 Washington sent troops from the Philippines to China to suppress the Boxer nationalist uprising. In 1947, after granting Philippine independence and as the Cold War began, the United States established military bases at Clark Field and Subic Bay as links in a chain of bases encircling the Soviet Union. Clark and Subic supported U.S. military interventions in Korea and Vietnam, and Fidel Ramos served in both with Philippine army units. These two wars were fought, according to the Pentagon, to stop the spread of Soviet Communism. When the Soviet Union and the Cold War collapsed, the Pentagon declared its goal to be the promotion of regional stability, particularly in the Third World. It was under this heading that the Bush administration waged the Gulf War when Saddam Hussein threatened U.S.-Saudi control of Mideast oil, and Philippine bases provided essential supplies to U.S. naval forces in that war.

With Clinton in the White House forward deployment in the Asia-Pacific continues to be a matter of concern to the U.S. military, according to Admiral Charles R. Larson, commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific. In October 1993 Admiral Larson gave a speech in Honolulu describing what he called the Clinton administration's vision of a "New Pacific Community." He offered two lists of the elements he considered essential to the military security of the Clinton vision. The first item on both lists was forward deployment. "There is no better way to prove our commitment than to station or deploy our sons and daughters," said the Admiral; and "Nothing reas-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sures our allies so much. . . . Forward military presence gives us great training and reduces our response time to crises."

Citing the fact that U.S. trade with the Pacific region is now greater than with either Europe or Latin America, the Admiral pointed to the emerging importance of Asia for the United States and to the reflection of this in U.S. forces deployed abroad: "as overseas forces have drawn down in most parts of the world, Pacific forces have been spared." Except, that is, for U.S. forces in the Philippines, as the Admiral somehow failed to note.

During the Cold War there were three main centers of U.S. forward deployment in Asia on bases in Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines. Today U.S. troop levels in the first two countries remain at about 35,000-40,000 each, near their Cold War strength, but this is not the case with the third. Here democratic and nationalist pressures released by the overthrow of the Marcos dictatorship resulted in the adoption of a Philippine constitution providing that the presence of foreign troops on Philippine soil would have to be approved by the Philippine Senate in a two-thirds vote. It was this provision that enabled the same pressures to block the Senate ratification of a treaty renewing U.S. base rights in September 1991. Soon after came the departure from the Philippines of 14,000 U.S. troops who had been deployed there during the Cold War.

Since the Philippine Senate defeat of the bases treaty Admiral Larson has done what he could to restore the Philippines to its former use as an area of forward deployment using the access policy as a means to this end. Even before nationalist resistance terminated U.S base rights in the Philippines, however, the U.S. military was working to establish access agreements in Southeast Asia with Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand. Today, while expanding forward deployment with access agreements, the Pentagon hangs on to bases left over from the Cold War, though somewhat diminished in numbers and personnel. All this and a huge arms budget as well are kept in place to hold the United States in the posture

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of global superpower, with the avowed purpose of policing regional stability, and with guaranteed benefits for those in the military industrial complex in terms of jobs, career advancement, fat salaries, and profits.

On November 6, 1992, Admiral Larson took the first step to reopen the Philippines to the presence of the U.S. military when he made an arrangement providing the Pentagon with access to Philippine ports and airfields. He did this at a meeting of a Philippine-U.S. Mutual Defense Board which had been established in 1951 when, under the pressure of the Cold War, the Philippines had signed a Mutual Defense Treaty with Washington. The Admiral described the November arrangement, which came only a little more than a year after the defeat of the bases treaty, in a way that seemed designed to minimize its importance and any nationalist opposition that might result. It would, he said, provide for port visits, aircraft transits, and small unit exercises. This was a description of a limited access—but, U.S. officials added, one that might be broadened in the future.

Sure enough, in June 1993, following another meeting of the Philippine-U.S. Mutual Defense Board, Admiral Larson announced a decisive enlargement of the arrangement's terms. Pointing to potential crises in the Mideast and Korea, he told the press the United States was prepared to send troops to both areas, and, should this take place, would use the Philippines as a staging area. In effect, the Admiral declared that the access arrangement restored to the Philippines its essential and historic role in the Philippine-U.S. security relationship as a launching pad for U.S. intervention in the Asia-Pacific region. Philippine access could no longer be called limited.

During the fall of 1993 the Pentagon made an initial effort to give flesh and blood to access policy in the Philippines. In September the nuclear-capable destroyer, *U.S.S. O'Brien*, tied up at Manila, the first U.S. naval ship to visit a Philippine port since the closure of the bases. Another such first took place on October 18 when U.S troops set foot on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Philippine soil in central Luzon. They came, 1,300 strong, to take part in "Operation Balikatan," a joint training exercise with the Philippine armed forces that lasted till November 27 and included civic action maneuvers.

Such exercises had taken place several years earlier when the United States had the bases, serving to give an extra gloss to already existing forward deployment. After U.S. withdrawal they took on a more significant character, as Philippine military officials pointed out: "The exercises will give the U.S. military the opportunity to test its capability to rapidly deploy forces in the region after American bases in the Philippines were closed down."

Since Ramos had supported U.S. access in his successful presidential campaign of 1992 and the bases before that, it was not surprising that he made a point of attending the joint military exercise in November, five days before he left for the United States to meet with President Clinton. His presence at the exercise underlined the importance his administration gave to the event. It was the first time a Philippine chief executive had attended one since they began in 1981. In an address while there he welcomed the return of U.S. troops: "It is comfortable for us. . . to have exercises with a substantial number of U.S. forces working alongside our own soldiers." Admiral Larson also expressed approval of the exercise, telling the Philippine press, "The United States is now beefing up its Pacific policy. . ."

On his return from his meeting with Clinton, as noted earlier, Ramos told reporters the two leaders had agreed to strengthen Philippine-U.S. defense cooperation. Given the Philippine President's account, therefore, the Washington meeting can be seen as the next step forward in the development of the new, post-bases military relationship. Even before it took place, however, Ramos had indicated his intention to use the meeting to strengthen the relationship, as was reported from Manila to the *Washington Post* of November 11: "Behind Manila's pressure for a recently arranged one-on-one meeting between Ramos and Clinton is a sense that Washing-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ton still resents the eviction of the U.S. military from the bases here. . . ." Ramos had told the *Post* reporter: "I don't think there is any rancor as such in the Philippines, but it could exist in the United States. . . and that is what I would like to remedy."

II. Automatic Access: Strategic Advantage Without the Expense

Evidently the office of the Philippine President had a very definite idea as to how the new Philippine-U.S. security relationship could be strengthened at Washington. San Francisco's *Philippine News* of November 10-16 carried an article considering the prospects for the meeting and the topics suggested for discussion there by various departments of the Manila government. This was the suggestion from Ramos's headquarters in Malacanang Palace:

> Malacanang sources said bilateral security relations between Manila and Washington would likely involve the grant of "automatic" access rights to American military forces who may want to use the country's major seaports and airfields. The sources said the government's offer to expand bilateral security relations "sits well with the Americans' evolving security doctrine of 'many places not bases.'"

A conclusive enlargement of the access arrangement, essentially reversing the decision of the Philippine Senate to remove the bases, automatic access implies the Pentagon's right to use any major seaport or airfield in the Philippines as a staging area for U.S. intervention in Korea, the Mideast, or wherever else, without seeking so much as a by-your-leave from the Philippine government. In its absence of Philippine controls it resembles the "unhampered military operations" dictator Marcos conceded the Pentagon with respect to the bases, a condition U.S. military authorities had insisted on since they first established these installations in 1947.

Access makes up for the loss of the bases' advantages of permanent forward deployment by the ready or immediate availability of the deployment site, and this depends on the government of the host country. In the Gulf War it took four days of intensive lobbying by high officials of the Bush admin-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

istration before the Saudi royal family could be persuaded to activate access and allow U.S. troops on Saudi soil. Presumably automatic access would do away with such delay in the Philippines. Speed in the transport of troops by air-lift and sea-lift also compensates for the loss of the bases, and the Pentagon has developed technology to make this possible. In a *Boston Globe* story of February 3, 1994, the U.S. Navy announced it would build a $1.5 billion class of fast cargo ships "to transport arms and troops to global hot spots at speeds up to twenty-four knots."

But to understand what access policy could mean to the Philippines, another prospective improvement in access technology must be borne in mind. Todd Dalland, an architect whose firm specializes in tent design, told an interviewer from the *New York Times* (November 7, 1993) that the U.S. military had him working on "a portable, modular, aluminum frame supported tent system" with three membranes that open and close in different combinations to afford protection against extremes of heat and cold. The military, according to Dalland, "are really looking now to have portable military cities as opposed to big permanent military bases all around the world." With such a portable tent city system the Pentagon would no longer be tied down to permanent barracks as formerly at Clark and Subic, but would be free to use the major ports and airfields of the entire archipelago as staging areas for interventionist forces, with housing provided on very short order.

Moreover, unlike the former use of the bases for which the United States paid a *quid pro quo* in aid, this new ceding of Philippine sovereignty would evidently be without a price tag. "We hardly discussed aid at all," Ramos told the press about his meeting with Clinton, and, of course, in the case of access there are no American expenses for base upkeep or for the maintenance of a sizeable body of troops. The Japanese government contributes so much to the upkeep of the 40,000 U.S troops on the bases in its country that Washington finds it cheaper to keep them there than at home. As it refrains from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressing the U.S for the aid previously regarded as remuneration for deployment rights, the Philippine government appears to be joining that of Japan in providing financial relief to the mendicant superpower in Asia, straitened as it is by debt and budgetary restrictions.

All in all, it is doubtful whether Ramos could have brought anything to Washington more effective in repairing relations that might have been damaged by base eviction than a grant of automatic access. Moreover, before the meeting occurred there were strong indications—coming from unidentified Malacanang sources and from a Cabinet subcommittee headed by Foreign Secretary Romulo—that such a move would be made. Afterwards, when he got home, Ramos indicated that his intentions for the meeting had been achieved when he told the airport crowd that welcomed him: "We can look forward to a bilateral relationship freed from doubts and resentments." Somehow he had made up for the bases' loss.

Yet the two leaders had no more to tell the public about their discussion of the new security relationship than the following, taken from the official transcript of the press conference held after their meeting:

Clinton: The end of the Cold War and the closure of the bases there . . . has not changed the basis for continuing cooperation between our two nations. . . . I want to thank President Ramos for his action to ensure the renewal of our close security cooperation. Those efforts have enabled a successful visit of the *U.S.S. O'Brien* to Manila in a joint military exercise on Philippine territory.

Ramos: Security cooperation, particularly within the framework of the Philippine-U.S. Mutual Defense Treaty of 1951, remains a vital element in Philippine-American relations. President Clinton and I agreed that our cooperation in security matters must be strengthened despite the changes in the global and regional security situation which no longer requires the permanent stationing of American forces in the Philippines. The Mutual Defense Treaty continues to be valuable to the security of East Asia. We welcome. .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. the continuing American commitment to regional security which President Clinton reaffirmed today.

Forward deployment is of key importance to the security of the Clinton vision of a New Pacific Community in the opinion of Admiral Larson, and it is the access arrangement that brings the Philippines into line once more as a strategic location of U.S. forward deployment in the Pacific. But in the two leaders' report of the discussion of security matters at their meeting, this arrangement goes unnamed. It can be seen only in partial outline with references to anachronistic bases, the port visit, the military exercise, and the U.S. commitment to regional stability. There is discussion of the mutual agreement to strengthen the Philippine-U.S. defense relationship, but what Malacanang sources had put forward as the means to this end, automatic access, remains unmentioned, altogether out of sight.

Nevertheless, while it cannot be said to be definitely the case, it seems likely that the grant of automatic access was made on Ramos' visit. If Ramos made the offer, Washington certainly wouldn't have turned it down, and it is reasonable to suppose he did so. After all, to float the prospect of a grant so valuable to the Pentagon and then to dash it down and fail to follow through would hardly be the way to achieve the improvement in relations Ramos so obviously desired.

III. Philippines: Resistance to U.S. Military Encroachment

The reticence of the two leaders with respect to automatic access and the access policy in general may have had good cause: a concern for Philippine public opinion.

Filipino sensitivities to features of the access policy are acute and arise from what amounts to a renewed confrontation between Philippine aspirations for sovereignty and the hegemonic policies of the Pentagon. Under provisions of the Philippine constitution and by means of the democratic process, the Philippine people rid their country of the U.S. military presence. Now with the access policy, the U.S military

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plans to reestablish its presence in the Philippines, the Senate vote and the Philippine constitution to the contrary notwithstanding. Access presents itself to Filipinos, therefore, as a direct challenge on the part of the part of the remaining superpower to the democratic process and constitutional integrity of their country.

Worries about popular attitudes may also help explain why the sponsors of the access arrangement for the Philippines have brought it forward in such an erratic manner. The Philippine-U.S. Mutual Defense Board established this arrangement at its meeting in November 1992. But before that meeting took place, U.S. officials said they were only interested in access if the Filipinos wanted it, and Philippine authorities in turn said it would not be on the meeting's agenda. Then without further notice access did appear on the agenda, and the arrangement was confirmed. Again, before Ramos met Clinton in November 1993, Malacanang sources predicted the meeting would see a grant of automatic access. When public and official reports came from the meeting, however, automatic access had disappeared from view. At the hands of Philippine and U.S authorities access resembles nothing so much as a shell game: now you see it, now you don't.

Such are the difficulties of giving official voice to a neocolonial policy like access in a country where public opinion has a strong democratic and nationalist slant. In such circumstances the U.S military well understands the best thing to do—keep it a secret! *Global Outreach,* the Congressional study, states: "Military access agreements are generally classified on the grounds that they might be politically sensitive for the host country: in fact DOD (Department of Defense) does not issue an unclassified list of access agreements."

Despite the Pentagon's interest in keeping it quiet, access policy has caused public apprehension and protest in the Philippines from the beginning. The moment the access arrangement was announced in November 1992, it was met by opposition, coming especially from groups and individuals

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who had participated in the movement against the bases. This has continued, so that each new step in the development of Philippine access has exacerbated the issue and drawn increasing fire on the head of President Ramos, who has come to the fore as its chief Philippine proponent.

After the meeting of the Mutual Defense Board in June 1993, as Admiral Larson announced plans to use the Philippines as a staging area, three influential Philippine Senators asked Foreign Secretary Romulo to explain the new security alliance with the United States. Indicating insufficient information about the new security relationship, Senator Tanada, who had played a prominent part in the defeat of the bases treaty, said: "We will have to ensure that in entering into such an alliance, it does not violate the constitutional ban on foreign forces on our soil."

The same post-Marcos constitution that opened the way to the elimination of the U.S. military presence contained a provision banning nuclear weapons from the Philippines. So when the nuclear capable *U.S.S. O'Brien* visited Manila in September, an organization that had helped lead the struggle against nuclear weapons and bases, the Nuclear-Free Philippines Coalition, raised its voice in protest. Speaking for the Coalition was its chairperson, Professor Roland Simbulan of the University of the Philippines, who denounced the *O'Brien's* visit as "a clear assault on the Philippine Constitution" and a direct result of the access agreement. Joining in the protest were the League of Filipino Students and the Central Luzon Alliance for a Sovereign Philippines.

The joint military exercise and President Ramos' participation in it came under attack from Senator Arturo M. Tolentino, a conservative and veteran lawmaker and constitutional expert. The Senator accused the Philippine President of being party to a violation of the Constitution, citing its prohibition of "foreign military bases, troops, and facilities. . . except under a treaty concurred in by the Senate." After President Ramos claimed the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1951 made legal the presence of U.S troops, Senator Tolentino

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quoted from the Treaty to show it allowed U.S. troops only in the case of an attack on the Philippines by a foreign country. In using the Treaty to justify a violation of the Constitution, the President was "misleading the Filipino people," the Senator charged.

This was harsh criticism of the Philippine President. His most severe condemnation, however, came in connection with the proposed Ramos visit to Washington. Running through the comment on this was a sense of foreboding that it might decisively escalate the surrender of sovereignty begun by the access arrangement of the preceding fall. For Senator Tanada the coming trip brought to mind Admiral Larson's troubling forecast of the Philippines as a jumping off point for U.S troops, and he gave voice to "fears expressed that. . . President Ramos might forge an agreement that would overthrow the Senate's historic decision." Recalling high hopes that Ramos seemed poised to repudiate, the editor of the *Philippine Daily Inquirer* chided him for "trying to appease the Americans" for kicking out the bases: "Why apologize for it? It was the most magnificent thing this nation did in a long time. It is the one proof there is the nation. . . will no longer be pulled along by the gold-plated chain around its neck." But it was the *Malaya* editor who, with quiet but deadly effect, focussed on the grant of automatic access as the clinching point of a great betrayal:

> The proposal. . . to extend automatic access rights to American military forces who may want to use Philippine airfields and shipping facilities would clearly circumvent and nullify the Senate's conclusive vote to remove the bases. It would also be a clear violation of Section 25, Article XVIII, which says foreign troops or facilities shall not be allowed in the Philippines. If Mr. Ramos enters into such a deal he could be impeached. . . . To nullify the vote against the bases through such transparent tricks and stratagems as access would be treason.

The *Malaya* editorial makes one thing very clear: if automatic access was granted at Washington in November, it would be best for the parties concerned if the Philippine public

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

believed it never happened. Otherwise the political position of President Ramos, one of the Pentagon's most loyal friends, might be jeopardized.

It is not a long step from the suppression of information that would tend to damage friends of the Pentagon in a foreign land to active support for such friends. When U.S. forward deployment took the form of the bases, it served for years as a source of extensive U.S. intervention in Philippine politics, climaxing in Washington's embrace of the dictator Marcos. Could not U.S support for forward deployment in the form of access lead to similar activity? Indeed, when access currently serves to undermine the Philippine constitution, political intervention of a subversive sort is already apparent.

While access in the Philippines is preeminently a policy sponsored by the Pentagon, it appears to have the blessing of President Clinton. In his account of the Ramos-Clinton press conference following their meeting, the *New York Times* correspondent wrote that Clinton "was. . . *pointed* in his praise of Mr. Ramos for permitting a visit by a United States ship and allowing a joint exercise by American and Filipino troops." (emphasis added) President Clinton's attitude was evidently quite explicit in approval of both the first fruits of access and the leader who made them possible.

This raises certain questions. If Clinton is urgent in his requests that Russia withdraw its troops from the Baltic states where they are not wanted, how is it that he approves putting U.S. troops on Philippine soil where they are constitutionally forbidden? If Clinton's foreign policy aims to support democracy all over the world, how can he let the Pentagon undermine the Philippine constitution by breaking its ban on foreign troops?

Nor is the Philippines the only Third World country to be so manhandled by the U.S military on the Clinton watch. Colombia also has a constitution that prohibits the presence of foreign military forces without Senatorial approval. Early in January 1994 the Pentagon landed some 150 U.S. soldiers on Colombia's Pacific coast, ostensibly for civic action—to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

build a road, a school, a clinic—but without the approval of the Colombian Senate. This caused protest in the Colombian Congress and press, and a public opinion poll found that 66 percent of those questioned felt the incident to be "damaging" or "very damaging," plainly reflecting feelings of wounded national sovereignty, according to the *New York Times*. The Colombian president defended his action in allowing U.S. troops without the Senate's sanction by citing a 1952 Cold War military cooperation treaty with the United States. But the country's highest court demanded a Congressional investigation of the President's conduct, and the Colombian Defense Ministry, abandoning a long-standing policy of secrecy, detailed the activities of U.S. soldiers in Colombia.

By pursuing the access policy in violation of the Philippine Constitution, the U.S. government is hypocritical in its avowal of the democratic values supported by U.S. voters. Access policy also runs counter to U.S. popular preferences in foreign policy in another way.

The sharp public outcry following U.S. casualties in Somalia shows the aversion of many U.S. voters to the cost of foreign military intervention. But it is the prime purpose of U.S. foreign bases and access rights to facilitate such intervention. In the Philippines, for example, as Admiral Larson pointed out, the access arrangement is designed precisely to make more feasible U.S. military ventures in the Mideast and Korea. Since the Admiral made this point, more than six months ago, the situation in Korea has taken on a more threatening aspect. A disturbing element has been the growing pressure of influential right-wing hawks, political and military, who urge that U.S. negotiations with North Korea take second place to a confrontational policy of threats and displays of military strength. Elements of a looming Korean crisis were in the background of the Ramos-Clinton meeting, while the meeting itself served to ratify—at the highest level—the possible use of the Philippines as a staging area for the sons and daughters of U.S. voters on their way to another Korean War, in Admiral Larson's scenario.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ramos-Clinton meeting has been hailed as a renewal of Philippine-U.S. friendship. This is a false assessment. The meeting represents rather a renewal of the U.S. military domination of the Philippines, first set in place when Admiral Dewey sailed into Manila Bay, nearly a hundred years ago. At the Washington meeting President Clinton gave his official sanction to this one-sided relationship, thereby identifying himself with an utter disregard for the Philippine people and their aspirations for national sovereignty. For his part, President Ramos came to offer access, giving the Pentagon once again the right to use the Philippines for its own purposes, and so displayed more friendship for the U.S. military-industrial complex then for the people of the United States, who need jobs and housing more than access rights and military expansion.

For friendship, the people of the United States had better turn to the opponents of access. For it is they who strive for a *new* Philippine-U.S. relationship, free from military dominance. This would be the best way to strengthen friendship between the two peoples, a goal long held by many in both countries.

The palliative measures suggested by most of our political quacks are like aspirin tablets given for a syphilitic headache. They may relieve; they will never cure.—Dr. Norman Bethune

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STORY OF WHY I AM HERE: OR, A WOMAN CONNECTS OPPRESSIONS

by ALICE WALKER

This article was originally a speech delivered at a Peace for Cuba Rally on February 1, 1992. We came across it recently and think that it is as relevant today as it was two years ago.—The Editors

Last January when the war against Iraq was started, I was in Mexico writing a novel about a woman who is genitally mutilated in a ritual of female circumcision that her society imposes on all females. Genital mutilation is a mental and physical health hazard that directly affects some 100 million women and girls worldwide, alive today, to whom it has been done. It affects the children to whom they give birth. Indirectly, because of its linkage to the spread of AIDS, especially among women and children, it affects the health and well-being of everyone on the planet.

With no television or radio, and no real eagerness to see or hear arrogant Western males discussing their military prowess, their delight in their own "cleanhanded," not at all brave destructiveness, I relied on a friend's phone calls to his son in San Francisco to keep me informed. His son told us about the huge resistance to the war in San Francisco, which made me love the city even more than I already did, and informed us

---

Alice Walker is a distinguished poet, short story writer, essayist, biographer, and Pullitzer-Prize winning novelist. She currently lives in northern California.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

too that he had been one of those demonstrators so outraged they'd closed down the Bay Bridge.

What to do? Go home and join the demonstrations, or continue to write about the fact that little girls' bodies are daily "bombed" by dull knives, rusty tin can tops and scissors, shards of unwashed glass—and that this is done to them not by a foreign power, but by their own parents? I decided to stay put. To continue this story about genital mutilation, aka "female circumcision," which I believe is vital for the world to hear. But of course I could not forget the war being waged against the earth and the people of Iraq.

Because I was thinking so hard about the suffering of little girls, while grieving over the frightened people trying to flee our government's bombs, my unconscious, in trying to help me balance my thoughts, did quite a wonderful thing. Instead of Saddam Hussein being the "demon" on whom the U.S. military's bombs were falling, I was given a substitute. Her name was *Sadie* Hussein, and she was three years old. So as the bombs were falling, I thought about Sadie Hussein, with her bright dark eyes and chubby cheeks, her shiny black curls and her dainty pink dress, and I put my arms around her. I could not, however, save her.

As it turned out, this was the truth. Saddam Hussein still reigns, at least as secure in his power over the Iraqis, according to some media sources, as George Bush is over North Americans. It is Sadie Hussein who has been destroyed, and who, along with 900,000 other Iraqi children under the age of five, is dying of cholera, malnutrition, infection, and diarrhea. Since the war, 50,000 such children have died. It is Sadie Hussein who starves daily on less than half her body's nutritional needs, while Saddam Hussein actually appears to have gained weight.

This is the story of why I am here today. I am here because I pay taxes. More money in taxes in one year than my sharecropping parents, descendants of enslaved Africans and Indians, earned in a lifetime. My taxes helped pay for Sadie Hussein's suffering and death. The grief I felt about this will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accompany me to my grave. I believe war is a weapon of persons without personal power, and that to go to war with an enemy who is weaker than you is to admit you possess no resources within yourself to bring to bear on your own fate. I will think of George Bush vomiting once into the lap of the Japanese Prime Minister and will immediately see hundreds of thousands of Iraqi children, cold, hungry, dying of fever, dysentery, typhoid, and every other sickness, vomiting endlessly into the laps of their mothers—who are also emaciated, starving, terrorized, and so illiterate they are unable to read Saddam Hussein's name no matter how large he writes it.

The slaughter of Iraqis and the destruction of so much of the earth deeply disturbed the world. Many of us could not ignore the pain in our hearts when we heard various U.S. government rumblings of: Cuba is next.

It is difficult to think of Cuba without also thinking of Fidel Castro. In fact, I cannot entirely do it, for I do not think of him at all as the demon he has been set up to be, over the past thirty-one years. Whereas I recognize Saddam Hussein as a victim of gross child abuse who grew up to abuse and victimize his people in the same way he was terrorized and tortured as a child, I recognize in Fidel Castro the Jesuit scholar and socially activist lawyer, the priest who finally picked up the gun. Though an attempt is constantly made to equate these two men, and this is visually easy because they are both "dark" and wear uniforms, I feel we must be vigilant about noting differences, and affirming them. Just for our own clarity and human integrity.

However, what is more important is that we remember that wars—whether waged through military strikes, as against Iraq, or through trade embargoes and blockades, as in the case of Cuba, are fought not against leaders only, but against the people, who may or may not even like the leader. And that children are the most devastated victims.

Thirteen years ago I went to Cuba, and the radiant health, intelligence, generosity, and joyousness of the people,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made it a sacred place for me. Ironically, in a place where there was very little church, I felt the most God.

Having been born among the poorest, least powerful, most despised population of the United States, spoken to as if I were a dog for asking to use a library or eat in a restaurant, the revelation that black people, who make up between 40 and 60 percent of Cuba's population, and women, who make up half, can share in all the fruits of their labors, was a major gift Cuba gave to me, a major encouragement to struggle for equality and justice, and one I shall never forget.

I refuse to be responsible for the suffering and death of hundreds or thousands of Fidelitos and Fidelitas. My ego is not stroked by the thought of sick and hungry Cuban children throwing up in their tired, scared, ill mothers' arms. What gives me pleasure is the thought that all children everywhere can be safe from deliberate brutality and cruelty; deliberate enslavement, ignorance, and genocide.

Rather than envy—as I think the U.S. government does—and therefore despise Cuba for its dedication to the health of its citizens and its elevation of black people, women, and the poor, I believe it has important lessons to teach our gadget-rich but spiritually bankrupt country: That the earth on which we live is the body of God. All people and living things are the body and soul of God. And that we do not serve God by making the earth and its people suffer, but by making the earth and its people whole. This is why I have always believed Fidel Castro is really a priest. We can look at the sound teeth, shining eyes, straight limbs, and strong minds of the Cuban people today and know that thirty-one years ago these same people would have been null and void. After thirty-one years of racism, sexism, poverty, assassinations, and despair in the United States, great numbers of my own generation—because of homelessness, joblessness, drugs—are certainly null and void.

I am far from blind to Cuba's imperfections. There are days when I think: How noble, how graceful it would be if Fidel Castro would simply retire. I think: doesn't he have a ton of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grandchildren to snuggle and jiggle on his knee before he dies? I also think this about George Bush and all the rest of the rich white male dictatorship we in North America suffer under. And have suffered under since the arrival of these men, 500 years ago. I am also highly skeptical of a revolution that has not produced younger men and women to lead it. But one thing is clear: Whatever its imperfections, in Cuba the poor have not been held in contempt; they have been empowered. Which is different from being made wealthy in a capitalist sense, and more lasting. A healthy body, a well trained mind, a sense of solidarity with one's people is harder to lose than a million dollars and offers more security. This empowerment of the poor: literacy, good health, adequate housing, freedom from ignorance, is the work of everyone of conscience in the coming century. Cuba has led the way, and is an object lesson to us. For if the poor are not empowered—by any means at their disposal—they will continue to be devoured by the rich. Just as women, if not empowered, will continue to be the slaves of men.

I have heard that rich Cubans in Miami (whose old money was no doubt made off the backs of slaves and the vulvas of women), and others who see Cuba as real estate, intend to buy Cuba, as if it is still the North American-owned plantation it was before the revolution. This is obscene. What has been paid for in blood, tears, and backbreaking work by the people of Cuba can not be bought; especially not by rich white Cubans in Miami, or by those North American profiteers who raped Cuba shamelessly over hundreds of years, and who, returning to that land, would hardly recognize it. Certainly it would surprise them not to encounter any of their former slaves, serfs, drug addicts, and prostitutes. Though prostitution may have returned, as Cuba's economic situation has worsened and disproportionate emphasis has been placed on tourism.

What can I tell you? Cubans always speak of defending The Revolution. I speak of defending ourselves from the grief and heartbreak of being accomplices to evil acts done in our

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

name and with our hardearned cash. I speak of defending our right not to be murderers. If I would rather die myself than run over a child in the street, how can I possibly accept squashing a million children from forty-five thousand feet? And to celebrate such a feat, I assure you, is quite impossible. To see the anti-abortion forces, including Bush, rage against poor and scared women, some of them homeless, who refuse to give life to a child they cannot support, while not even planting symbolic crosses for the actual children bombed to death in Iraq, is to witness cynicism in its most unconscionable form. I speak of defending our right to praise and uphold what is good about any other people's way of life, even as we recognize and criticize what is bad. To Cuba I would say your poets are the heartbeat of the revolution: Because that is what, by definition, poets are. If you force them to eat their words it is the revolution that will suffer indigestion and massive heart attack. Bread is not everything, after all, as women have always stressed: there must be roses too. And the roses of any revolution are the uncertainties one dares to share.

I speak of defending the Earth, our Mother God. I speak of defending and loving the Earth's children: All of us.

The true value of a human being is determined primarily by the measure and the sense in which he has attained liberation from the self.—Albert Einstein

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Stalinism, Imperialism, and Cuba

by Ken Morrison

A couple of suggestions for articles you might consider doing. Much is made in the anti-left propaganda about the millions who died as a result of Stalin's policies, the gulags, etc. But has anybody done a body count of the casualties of U.S. anti-Communist activities? You suggest two in the latest issue—the East Timor invasion and the suppression of the Communists in Malaysia which I will bet were at least partially a result of U.S. pressure. And then there were the millions who died in China because the United States backed the nationalists and prolonged the civil war; the Korean War which was a direct product of that U.S. policy; and the Vietnam War. And then the creation and prolongation of the Angolan civil war as a result of U.S. activities; the present mess in Afghanistan ditto; the staggering casualties in Central and South America as a result of U.S.-sponsored and backed anti-Communist policies, and so on and on. The total of all these activities, even if one confined the count to the post-Second World War era, must be quite staggering. Shouldn't it be reported?

Secondly, I was in Cuba for a holiday recently. It should be the Garden of Eden, but isn't for well known reasons. The people are having a really tough time though in the area my wife and I visited the children seemed to be reasonably healthy and in school, and the panhandling we met was for little luxuries like gum and cosmetics rather than for food. The standard of living and the infrastructure available (except in privileged places like the tourist hotels) reminded me of late Depression rural Canada. After the East German experience one shudders to think of what will happen to this

Ken Morrison is a long-time left political activist and MR Associate. He provided the Thunder Bay, Ontario contact address for war resisters during the sixties and has been excluded from the United States under the McCarran Act.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

society when the barriers come down and American tourist, consumer goods, and technology flood in. One has to assume that the Castro regime has trouble enough keeping things afloat without worrying about this development. Might a friendly outsider like MR be able to make some constructive suggestions?

I should mention that among the middle class Cubans we met there was some discontent with the lack of an open discussion of the options facing Cuba, and also with the Soviet-style payment of professionals and the like on about the same scale as truck drivers. However, these people recognized the abyss below as well as the opportunities above and didn't seem to be in revolting mood. Most serious was a cynicism about the party and its privileges—a feeling, for example, that medical aid that churches, and others, were supplying was directed to hospitals serving the party elite and the military and was not being distributed to the masses. How widespread this cynicism is we could not tell, but it certainly is a cancer on the body politic.

Just one final note, among the tourists at the hotel were some Germans who proudly identified themselves as being East Germans. Interesting.

It may be asserted as a principle of human organization that when new types of social organization are required, respectable, well-thought-of, and conservative people are unable to take part in them. Their moral and economic prejudices, their desire for the approval of other members of the group, compel them to oppose any form of organization which does not fit into the picture of society as they have known it in the past. . . . Nothing seems clearer than that the attitudes of any given ruling class are so set that all arguments in the world will not change them.
—Arnold Thurman

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

Actions Speak Louder than Words

by Michael D. Yates

Confessions of a Union Buster by Martin J. Levitt, New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1993, 302 pp., $22.50.

I.

In this period of capitalist crisis, labor-management cooperation schemes abound. Employers have turned to their employees with a familiar cry in hard times: we are all in this together so we must plan our future cooperatively. Past antagonisms will be forgotten, and a new era of equal partnership will begin. Wrapped in the rhetoric of patriotism, capital and labor will team up to increase productivity, improve quality, and restore the U.S. economy to its former glory.

Every labor leader who has bought into this latest incarnation of "capitalism with a human face" should buy copies of Martin Levitt's, *Confessions of a Union Buster* and hand them out to the rank and file. Most union officers won't have to read it, because they know that what it says about employers is true: they hate unions and will do whatever is needed to keep their workers uncontaminated by the union virus. The shame is that so many labor "statesmen" have refused to act on this knowledge and instead have become willing participants in what is essentially a management public relations campaign.

Michael D. Yates teaches Economics at the University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown and also teaches in a number of trade union programs. His latest book, *Longer Hours, Fewer Jobs: Employment and Unemployment in the United States*, is available for $10.00 from Monthly Review Press (1994).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

Union busters are people employed by a business to prevent employees from forming a union or, if a union already exists, to make it impossible for the union to negotiate a contract. They are an ancient breed, having plied their wares at least since the beginning of industrial capitalism more than 100 years ago. The infamous Pinkerton Agency, which provided the scabs for Andrew Carnegie in the Homestead strike, was founded in 1850. Before the passage of the Wagner Act (formally known as the National Labor Relations Act) in 1935, union busters could do pretty much as they pleased. It was not illegal for a corporation such as General Motors to hire a union buster to spy on workers, to infiltrate their unions and act as a provocateur, to spread rumors and foment distrust among employees, even to act as a purchasing agent for arms and ammunition. It was not illegal for an employer to fire workers for union activities and to blacklist them so that no other employer would hire them. It was not at all unusual or illegal for the police, themselves, to do the same things. During the "Little Steel" strike of 1937, a contingent of Chicago police were billeted inside of the Republic Steel plant. The company supplied them with ammunition and special billy clubs, which they used to beat and kill strikers during the Memorial Day Massacre.

The Wagner Act made most of the activities of the union busters illegal, "unfair labor practices" which could be severely penalized by the newly created National Labor Relations Board. The Act did not initially have much effect on what *Monthly Review* founder, Leo Huberman, called the "Labor Spy Racket" in his classic account. Using the United States Senate's LaFollette Committee reports, Huberman detailed numerous cases of union busting perpetrated after passage of the Wagner Act. It is instructive to note how employers then, as now, sang the sweet phrases of labor-management cooperation. Huberman quotes GM President Alfred P. Sloan:

> The Management of General Motors holds that there is no real conflict of interests between employers and employees. . . .Enlightened employers and enlightened employees realize that they have a mutuality of interests such as to dictate the wisdom of maintaining the highest degree of cooperation and harmonious relations.

Just prior to this letter, GM purchased, through the chief of police of Flint, Michigan, "ten no. 16 gun clubs and ten dozen (120) no 16-A shells for same. . ." in preparation for "labor troubles" at the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chevrolet plant. The seller was the Lake Erie Chemical Company, which also sold GM "two long range gas guns, single action, of the hammer-hinged type, at $40 each, and 12 long range gas charges for these guns, at $80 a dozen, or a total of $170" for "troubles" at the Buick plant.

III.

The great industrial union organizing drives of the late 1930s put the union busters on the defensive as the NLRB began to enforce the Wagner Act. While the most vicious types of union bashing continued to be used, the focus began to shift toward a more sophisticated approach dubbed "union prevention." The first of the new firms, Labor Relations Associates, was formed in 1939, just two years after the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Wagner Act. Its founder, Nathan Shefferman, developed many of the techniques utilized by his numerous progeny, including Modern Management Methods and the other firms with which author Levitt was associated.

The labor laws, themselves, provided the key elements in the union busters' bag of tricks. First, supervisors are not considered employees under the National Labor Relations Act and do not enjoy its protections. Therefore, it is perfectly legal for employers to force supervisors to spearhead an anti-union campaign under the direction of people like Levitt. Second, the 1947 Taft-Hartley revisions of the Wagner Act gave employers free reign to wage aggressive propaganda campaigns against the unions which were trying to organize their workers. The "free speech" provision of Section 8(c) of the Act allows an employer to say anything, even something patently false, as long as the employer does not say anything which is coercive or which promises benefits to the employees.

Third, the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959 requires labor consultants (the polite phrase for union busters) to file financial disclosures with the Secretary of Labor. The consultant is supposed to name its clients, the fees charged, and the terms of the contract with the employer. The employer must also report its expenditures on labor consultants. Unfortunately, the law has gaping loopholes, loopholes which Levitt calls "shameful." An employer has to report the hiring of union busters who engage in "persuader" activity, defined as direct contact with workers to get them to vote against the union. If the consultant only speaks directly to supervisors, no report needs to be filed. In addition, the labor consultants do not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have to report activities related to specific legal proceedings, so naturally they claim that most of their activities are so connected. Finally, where the union busters are attorneys, as many of them are, the reporting requirements may be avoided by claiming attorney-client privilege.

The weaknesses in the laws have been compounded by their weak enforcement. Employers routinely violate the laws, knowing that they will probably not be caught and punished lightly if they are. For example, Section 8(a)(5) of the National Labor Relations Act compels employers to bargain in good faith with the unions which their employees have voted to represent them. But if an employer bargains in bad faith, the penalty is an NLRB order to bargain in good faith. Except in rare cases, the employer will not have to pay any fines for denying its workers a basic right. No wonder that employers today seldom bargain in good faith unless faced with a credible threat of economic loss from a strike or some other comparable form of worker pressure.

IV.

Of the many union-busting campaigns waged by Mr. Levitt, none was more vicious or more instructive of the tactics involved than that at the Copeland Oaks Retirement Home in Sebring, Ohio. Copeland Oaks was a swank operation, with lavish accommodations and ample, well-groomed grounds. It was affiliated with the Methodist Church, which had recently hired a new director who had completely revamped its operations, converting a large deficit into a sizeable surplus. Its 300 nonsupervisory workers were overwhelmingly female: nurses, nurses' aides, housekeepers, janitors, cooks, and waitresses. Their pay was low, barely above minimum wage, and their benefits were meager. But they needed their jobs. Many supported families; their communities were poor, and not many other jobs were available. Most enjoyed the work, especially the feeling that they were helping to make life more enjoyable for the elderly, and often lonely, residents. Copeland Oaks was also an important social outlet for the women, a kind of second home, with coworkers as an extended family.

The union-busting business boomed during the 1970s and 1980s, and much of its growth can be attributed to a large increase in the number of places like Copeland Oaks. As the heavily-unionized goods-producing industries shrank, the service-producing industries grew rapidly. The health services industry, in which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Copeland Oaks is classified, along with janitorial services, finance, insurance, real estate, restaurants, and personnel services, accounted for nearly all of the net growth in employment. Firms in these industries rely upon cheap, often female and nonwhite, labor to generate enormous profits. When unions, desperate to reverse their declining membership, began to respond to requests from service workers to send organizers, the union busters saw golden opportunities. They bombarded employers with letters, phone calls, and advertisements, promising to prevent organizing attempts from starting, to defeat them if they had already begun, and to deny the union contracts if they had already won elections. They often found prospective clients through a form of ambulance chasing—by checking the new union election petitions at the nearest NLRB office. Hospital administrators, bank officers, and restaurant owners were only too happy to hire people like Levitt, no matter how reprehensible their tactics or how high their fees (Levitt charged Copeland Oaks $750 per day). By the end of the 1980s, there were many hundreds of union-busting firms, so many that it was almost certain that *any* organizing drive in the service sector would run up against one.

At Copeland Oaks, Levitt used a number of classic union-busting tactics, along with some tailor-made for the situation. All of them were based upon what might be called the rallying cry of union busters: "delay, deceive, divide." When Levitt was called in, the union had already won enough support to petition the NLRB for an election. Levitt's first task was to delay the election as long as possible, to give him a chance to begin to spread his poison. It takes a lot of courage for a group of poorly paid and easily replaceable workers to organize a union. But once they have, they want results. The longer it takes for their union to be certified and to begin to bargain, the weaker will be their resolve and the more susceptible they will be to the union buster's propaganda. Through a lawyer, Levitt challenged the scope of the bargaining unit, arguing that the Licensed Practical Nurses were really supervisors and therefore not allowed to be in the bargaining unit. He also frivolously claimed that the home was not covered by the National Labor Relations Act. He did not expect to win either of these objections; their purpose was delay. However, he did win the first one, testimony to the pro-employer stance of the NLRB during the Reagan years. The LPNs were staunch supporters of the union, but now they would have to help Levitt defeat it or risk being fired. Levitt cleverly blamed their exclusion from the bargaining unit on the NLRB.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Supervisors are the key to every union-busting campaign. They can be forced to participate in it, although the trick is to make them want to defeat the union. Levitt held endless meetings with the supervisors, at one point hiring his wife to talk to some of them, figuring that women would be most likely to open up to another woman. He told them that the workers' support of the union was a personal betrayal. He told them that workers whom the supervisors thought of as friends were actually mocking them behind their backs. He repeatedly portrayed the union as an outsider, deviously trying to insinuate itself between the once loyal workers and the supervisors. He told them that if the union won, everything would have to be done according to strict and impersonal rules. To bring this deception home to both workers and supervisors, he got the employer to institute such rules. The friendly morning meetings with which workers often began their day were eliminated. Supervisors were forbidden to talk with employees, even when they worked alongside of them. Most importantly, the workers were no longer allowed to chat with the residents and were forced to refer to them by their formal names. This was devastating to workers and residents alike.

The supervisors were expected to have one-on-one talks with each worker under them to solicit information which Levitt could use to ferret out informers and to spread rumors. Open union supporters were isolated as much as possible, closely dogged by their supervisors and denied contact with fellow employees. Pressure on union supporters might cause some of them to quit or to do something which could get them legally fired, and it sent a message to other workers that open union allegiance was risky. One supervisor, himself sympathetic to the union, was fired amid rumors that he had stolen money from the employer. The general idea was to create a climate of fear and division and then say that this climate did not exist before the union came along. Of course, this was true, thanks to Levitt, but since he never spoke directly to the workers, they were never exactly sure what was causing their misery.

The union knew that a union buster was at work, but Levitt kept the initiative and was there every day. The union could not legally be on the employer's property, so it was always in the position of responding to Levitt's attack. He had questions planted in a suggestion box for the supervisors to answer or for spies to ask at a union meeting. Each question was meant to put the union on the spot and to sow seeds of distrust among the workers. One might imply that everyone would be forced to join the union. Another one

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might suggest that the union could force them out on strike. Another might imply that they could lose the benefits they now had if the union won. By the time the union could respond, a lot of damage had already been done.

Levitt went so far as to organize an anti-union group among the residents of the home. Some of the residents had been corporate executives and did not have to be persuaded to help the anti-union campaign. Others joined when supervisors told them that union supporters might physically harm them and would probably go on strike, making their continued care difficult. Residents began to harass union advocates, and they sent out a letter urging employees to reject the union. Levitt knew that a union would, if anything, improve the care given to the aged residents, but he also knew that the emotional attachment which the workers had with the old people made them very susceptible to his manipulations.

V.

Despite Levitt's best efforts, the union won a narrow victory in the representation election. When the NLRB agent who conducted the election accidently left the ballot box unattended, Levitt actually contemplated vandalizing it. But he was so confident of victory that he let this opportunity pass. After the loss, he wished that he had tampered with the ballot box. However, Levitt was quick to sense that the employer was not about to deal with the union, so he responded enthusiastically to a request that he continue to work to defeat it, this time at the bargaining table. When the employer's attorney refused to participate in a campaign of bad-faith bargaining, Levitt found one who would. He did not hesitate to break the law, because he understood that the law against bad-faith bargaining was poorly enforced and weakly punished. This was especially the case with the Reagan NLRB, staffed with persons hostile to the very law they were sworn to enforce.

The bad-faith bargaining campaign began with a series of meetings with the supervisors. Playing upon their fears and anger, Levitt easily got them to cooperate with his new game plan. Supervisors were ordered to run their departments strictly by the book and to never relate to their workers as human beings. Workers were again denied any close personal contact with patients. The workers had been told before that a union would make worklife subject to rigid contract rules, so now that the union had won, the employer instituted and enforced such rules. Workers were told that they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have to bargain to keep the benefits which they already enjoyed, and the employer began to (illegally) take away benefits such as rest breaks and free meals. Employees were told that the employer could not give them any wage or benefit increases because there was a union in place (This is not true if the union agrees to the raises or they had already been scheduled by the employer). Each union stalwart was subject to still tighter supervision, given difficult assignments, and followed around and harassed by supervisors in the hope that she would quit.

Next, Levitt delayed the first bargaining meeting as long as possible, by saying that he had a tight schedule, by refusing to meet at a convenient place, and by insisting that the local union president be at the meeting. When the first session was finally scheduled, Levitt brought the supervisor of each local bargaining team member to the table and had them sit directly across from their charges. From the beginning, Levitt stalled the bargaining by refusing to discuss the union's proposals and repeatedly delaying the preparation of counterproposals. To give the appearance of real bargaining, Levitt agreed to a few trivial items, such as the union recognition clause, hardly a concession since the law had already given this to the union. Back at the home, he orchestrated a campaign of rumors, smearing the union with charges of autocracy and strike mongering.

When the union could take no more of this, it took a strike vote, which Levitt used to great advantage by playing up the vulnerability of the home's elderly patients. The employer put into effect a strike contingency plan aimed at intimidating and demoralizing the strikers. Help wanted ads began to appear in local newspapers; security was tightened and people were told that the strike would be violent (Levitt helped this lie along by having thugs vandalize cars of workers hostile to the union); and the residents were assured that the employer would insure their care and safety in the event of a strike. Finally, when the home opened a new medical center on the premises, it claimed that the center was a separate business, and it began to transfer union jobs into it. In this way the bargaining unit itself was decimated.

The union ultimately filed unfair labor practice charges against the employer for the bad-faith bargaining and the transfer of union jobs. But a whole year had gone by, and a union's certification is only good for a year. After one year, a union can be decertified by vote of the workers. In fact, a decertification petition was filed by the employees, many of whom had not been employed during the original union campaign. The NLRB delayed the hearing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the decertification petition until the unfair labor practice charges were decided. Incredibly, the Board found the employer not guilty of bad-faith bargaining, and although it did order eighteen workers reinstated with back pay (only one of them agreed to go back), it was too late for the union to win a contract. The union simply filed a "disclaimer of interest" and cut its losses by abandoning the struggle.

VI.

The most interesting parts of this book are Levitt's accounts of union-busting campaigns. He also examines his life and details his descent into alcoholism and depression. Readers are left with no doubt that the typical union buster is as sleazy in his personal life as in his work. Our sympathy for Levitt's honesty and our relief that he is remorseful is tempered by our outrage at the lives he has ruined. Nonetheless, we can be grateful that he has revealed his trade so openly and made clear the true convictions of the overwhelmingly majority of employers.

What is needed now is for *all* labor leaders to admit the truths which Levitt has revealed and abandon labor-management cooperation schemes. I was at a party recently and a friend of mine waxed enthusiastic about President Clinton. What he liked about Clinton was that he would make any compromise with his enemies so that things might get a bit better for the little guy. Spoken like a true liberal! What he did not seem to grasp was that Clinton's "enemies" will never be satisfied, no matter how many compromises he makes. They want their entire agenda put in place, and the more compromises the liberals make, the closer the reactionaries will be to fulfilling their dreams. The results will not be good for the little people. Similarly, the more bones the liberal labor leaders throw to the employers, the more bones they will want and the more the workers will be thrown to the wolves. Employers respect one thing and one thing only—power. Independent working class action, not class collaboration, is the way to achieve power and the better lives for the working classes which go along with it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Recovering America's Radical History

by Gerald Meyer

New Studies in the Politics and Culture of U.S. Communism Edited by Michael E. Brown, Randy Martin, Frank Rosengarten, and George Snedeker. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1993, 330 pp., $18.00.

Anti-Communism has influenced—some would say, distorted—every aspect of U.S. scholarship. It should not be surprising, therefore, that anti-Communism has dominated the study of United States Communism itself. This volume of eleven essays demonstrates the value of a newly evolving approach to the history of the Communist Party which views it not as an object of vilification but as a phenomenon deserving understanding. The received version of the Communist Party's experience has been enormously influenced by scholars, such as Irving Howe, who at one time or other have been identified with varieties of social democracy which defined themselves by their opposition to Communism, and ex-Communists, like Theodore Draper.[1] Their work depicts an institution whose slavish devotion to the Soviet Union overshadows any other line of inquiry. Its leaders were hardbitten bureaucrats, its members (of whom we hear next to nothing) were dupes or, depending on the degree that any of them were aware of what they were doing, manipulators, deceivers, and traitors.

Liberal historians have written little directly about the subject. In the textbooks and general histories of the period that they author, the accomplishments of the Party in organizing the industrial working class or placing racial equality at the very top of the progressive

Gerald Meyer teaches History at Hostos Community College (CUNY) and is the author of *Vito Marcantonio: Radical Politician*, 1902-1954 (SUNY Press: Albany, 1989).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agenda are at best brushed in; the repression of the Party is marginalized by the attention given to "innocent" (that is, non-Communist) victims. However, in recent years liberal historians' treatment of the Party has tended to become fuller and more balanced. Not surprisingly, the excoriations of the social democrats and ex-Communists have attracted more response than the omissions of the liberals.

Since the publication of William Z. Foster's *History of the Communist Party* in 1952, the Communist Party itself has been unable to offer any meaningful presentation of its own history. International Publishers has printed some autobiographies and biographies of various of its leaders, which are of varying value, but no general history.[2] But then, as Eric Hobsbawm has pointed out, no Communist Party anywhere has been able to write its own history.

The new left defined itself ideologically and organizationally in opposition to the experience of the Communist Party and therefore its adherents lifted nary a pen to counter the anti-Communist interpretation of U.S. Communism. The new left in fact added a new series of criticisms of the Party from the left, most especially that its members' unwillingness to operate openly deterred the organization of an American left and contributed to the Party's repression.[3]

It took both the collapse of the old and the new lefts to clear the ground for a new interpretation of the Communist Party's experience. Memoirs of long time Party leaders and scholarly studies began to de-emphasize the discontinuities in the Party's theory and practice brought about by international events and focused on the Party's continuous activities on behalf of those who have not benefited from capitalism. Moreover, these studies have focused on the accomplishments of the Party: Al Richmond's *A Long View from the Left* (1972) documented the Party's leadership role in the 1935 San Fransisco general strike[4]; Roger Keeran's *The Communist Party and the Auto Workers Unions* (1980) presented the key role of Communists in organizing automobile workers.[5]

New Studies in the Politics and Culture of U.S. Communism presents versions of papers originally delivered at a conference held at the City University Graduate Center to commemorate the seventieth anniversary of the founding of the Party sponsored by the Research Group on Socialism and Democracy, which among its other concerns has sought to examine the history of the Party "free from uncritically negative biases." Central to this approach is the understanding that whatever the the lack of democracy within the Party and its subordination to the political perspective of the Soviet

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union, the CPUSA had fulfilled an important oppositional role in U.S. society.

Michael Brown's introductory essay on the historiography of the CPUSA places this book within the context of the "new historians" who have begun to apply the techniques of social history which have so powerfully influenced the discipline since the publication of E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* in 1963.[6] These historians approach the Communist Party not as a political institution but as a movement. The emphasis is thereby shifted from the leadership to the membership, from public pronouncements to actual experience.[7] The very best of these essays represent a major contribution to the new history of the Party.

There is no arena that absorbed more of the Party's time and energy than the organization of the working class into trade unions. The Party acted on the premise that the work of labor politics could not proceed until there was substantial progress toward the organization of the American working class. In "Communist Influence on American Labor," Keeran encapsulates this very large topic.[8] He first develops a typology for the existing interpretations of the Party's trade union work and concludes that

> the predominance of evidence produced by the last decade of scholarship decisively supports the conclusion that the Communist Party was an important and distinctive influence on the labor movement and that Communist influence was decidedly beneficial to unions and workers.

These studies show that workers in unions led by Communists worked under superior contracts and that these unions operated in a strikingly more democratic fashion than their counterparts led by non-Communists. Moreover, Keeran finds that the "most distinctive feature of Communist behavior in unions was their opposition to racial discrimination." Ultimately, a political organization which never numbered as many as one hundred thousand members organized unions with some millions of members.

Keeran shows that during the so-called Third Period (1928-34) the Party's organization of "revolutionary unions," which mainstream scholars have generally dismissed, frequently laid the groundwork for the highly successful organizing drives associated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. He also notes their contribution to the Communist-initiated Hunger March on March 6, 1930, which involved over one million people in demonstrations in major cities throughout the United States.

Unfortunately, this essay includes no mention of the Party's extensive involvement in AFL unions. Although unlike the CIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where the Party directly led or greatly influenced 40 percent of its internationals, it never achieved leadership of any of the American Federation of Labor's internationals. However, within the AFL, it did lead many important locals, and Communist-led caucuses (most consistently in the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union) challenged the leadership of other unions. Also Keeran basically concludes his essay with the expulsion of the Communist-led unions from the CIO in 1949. Yet despite the most extraordinary repression almost all of these unions continued to exist in some form, albeit with steadily decreasing connection to the CPUSA. The International Longshoremen's Workers Union remained intact and others, though in much weakened and reduced form, survived. One by one they merged with their heretofore antagonists. However, the United Electrical Workers Union still exists and upholds a version of trade unionism consonant with the radical origins of the CIO.

Mark Naison's "Communists and Liberals in the Popular Front" succeeds in one short essay in outlining substantial parts of the Party's history during the period of its greatest influence, the Popular Front, 1935-1939.[9] In 1936 Earl Browder declared that: "The direct issue in the 1936 election is not socialism or capitalism, but rather democracy or fascism." Working with "progressives" (that is, liberals willing to work with Communists), the Party helped build not only the CIO but an astounding array of organizations that impacted on every phase of American life.

He reminds us, for example, of the International Workers Order, a mutual aid society organized into sixteen language sections, which claimed 150,000 members in 1939. In its lodges the immigrant communities could sustain and pass on to the next generation their primary cultures, while participating in a wider secular "progressive" culture that featured celebrations of Negro History Week and May Day. They also provided meeting places and cadre for the organization of the CIO. Naison strangely omits discussion of the American Association for the Protection of the Foreign Born, which organized legislative advocacy and legal support for these same communities.

Naison also documents the enormous reach of the Party into the electoral politics of the period. Unfortunately, he neglects to discuss its most singular success in this arena—the American Labor Party. The ALP became a major force in New York City politics: it amassed almost 36 percent of Fiorello La Guardia's vote for reelection for mayor in 1937 and ensured Vito Marcantonio's reelections to Congress until he was defeated in 1950 by a coalition candidate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Democratic, Republican, and Liberal parties. During the Popular Front the Party ceded leadership to the social democrats. Its focus on fighting racial discrimination and fostering left-center unity, however, contributed to its gaining decisive control of the ALP by 1944.[10]

Naison's contribution is strongest in crediting the Party with doing nothing less than "reformulating U.S. nationality" through the creation of a popular culture that placed the contributions of Black people and all the immigrant groups on a footing equal to Anglo Saxons. In this schema, rejection of class privilege and race prejudice were to be replaced by a deeper democracy strong enough to defeat domestic and international fascism. It was during this period that jazz and folk music became integral to the Party's work. Popular Front culture flourished in Hollywood movies where the large numbers of Party members and sympathizers working in the industry helped populate movies with sympathetic characters who had Jewish or Italian names and place virtue in the the hearts of ordinary folks.

Naison misses the Party's work in searching for a U.S. history to sustain this new culture. Fortunately, Gerald Horne's "The Communist Party and African Americans in Historical Perspective" mentions the Party's contribution in rediscovering African American achievement during the Reconstruction Era.[11] Horne notes that "along with the trade union question, the Negro question was of central concern to the leadership of the CP." [12] Unfortunately Horne does not succeed in encapsulating the Party's connection to the African American experience.

Horne's essay does, however, contain some new and important information. For example, Horne discusses the close ties between the Garveyite movement and the Party. Most memorable however is his discussion of the African Blood Brotherhood, which as early as 1918 advocated a Black republic in the South. In 1925 the Black Brotherhood joined the Party enmasse bringing with it a tenet of the Party's program that has been universally ascribed to a Comintern *ukase*. Lastly, Horne reminds the reader of the Party's commitment to racial equality via a stunning quote from Browder which in part states: "everything that touches on the Negro question is for our Party of fundamental principled importance, a matter of life and death."

Alan Wald's "U.S. Communist Writers Reconsidered" represents a treasure trove of topics for scores of as-yet unwritten doctoral dissertations and books.[13] He estimates "there are several hundred

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U.S. Communist-influenced novelists and poets of real merit who have received no critical attention." (Unfortunately, he does not include American writers writing in languages other than English, perhaps especially those writing in Yiddish—who were influenced by the Communist movement.) He actually categorizes and lists them: under Jewish-American for example, he includes Nelson Algren, Tillie Olsen, and Abraham Polansky. These writers found that their participation in the Communist movement caused "an augmentation, complication, and enrichment of their literary lives." Wald reports that his research has "convinced me of the importance of reconsidering the centrality of the Communist experience in United States cultural history."

Wald identifies the suppression of this legacy as impoverishing the contemporary attack on the literary canon. The Party's unique contribution was to provide a literature which exposed class realities, elevated the experience of the workers, and took up topics of resistance. The current critique of the canon notes all the absences except that of the great majority of the people, the working class.

In central ways Wald's essay comes closest to confronting the most relevant question, that is, the great damage that anti-Communism has done not only to scholarship but the sustaining of an opposition culture. This can only be rectified Wald posits, if "we come to terms with the Communist [Party] foundation of the left movement in this country."

Annette Rubinstein's "Cultural World of the Communist Party" recalls the Party as a society where "there really was a feeling of genuine democracy" and "a much more fundamental sense of equality."[14] She explains: "You might speak to a rally of several thousand at Manhattan Center one day, climb up on a soap box to attract a dozen passers-by another, and act as an usher in Madison Square Garden the next week." She tells of the steadfastness of human relations forged within the Party by people whose love was not based on looking at each other but by looking in the same direction.

Ellen Schrecker's extraordinary compilation of the use of state power to destroy the United States Communist Party (and nowhere else has the comprehensiveness of these efforts been more clearly depicted) shows how every branch of government collaborated in demolishing the Communist movement—not only the Party, but every manifestation of its influence.[15] She notes:

While the FBI was pre-eminent, other participants included the State, Treasury, and Justice departments, the White House, the Immigration and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Naturalization Service, the Civil Service Commission, the Internal Revenue Service, the Subversive Activities Control Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the Post Office, and, of course, Congress and its investigating committees.

Schrecker then documents the role of local governments and private instituituions in this process. Frequently, individuals or organizations would find themselves under attack from two or more of these governmental agencies. Thousands upon thousands of hostile actions coming from all sides—with sanctions that included execution, jail terms, deportation, job loss, blacklisting, public humiliation, social isolation, physical and verbal attacks on self and loved ones—ultimately destroyed the political base of the party. She concludes that the demise of U.S. Communism can be ascribed to political repression and that the major accounts of the Party's decline overemphasize the role of the Party's mistaken tactics or the effects of Khrushchev's 1956 speech.[16] This reviewer only hopes that Schrecker's subsequent work in this area will include a full discussion of the Party's defense strategy and the almost total failure of the wider liberal community to support even the most minimal civil liberties for the Communist movement. The other essays—which discuss the Party and women, the Rapp Coudert Committee Hearings, Communist education, and a somewhat incongruous interview with the venerable C.P. leader Gil Green—do not equally succeed in synthesizing aspects of the Party's history or in opening up new ways of thinking about the Party. But in its totality this book represents a major contribution to the work of uncovering and writing the history of the U.S. Communist movement free from the influences of the Cold War. The addition of an index in subsequent editions would greatly increase the value of this book as a research tool. After all references to the Popular Front, the Party's influence on the CIO, etc., are scattered throughout the book.

Perhaps there is nothing this reviewer could say that would more convincingly demonstrate the importance of *New Studies in the Politics and Culture of U.S. Communism* than the lengthly review by Theodore Draper in *New York Review of Books* (January 13) denigrating both the book and its authors.[17] Draper simply will not abide scholarship about the Communist Party which attempts to make the Communist Party a "part of the larger family of socialism and democracy" and which refuses to view the Party "as if it were different from other political phenomena in the United States." In the middle of his excoriations, Draper loses himself and openly laments: "Why should every other 'anti'—anti-capitalism, anti-liberalism, anti-rac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism, anti-sexism, and all the rest—be intellectually permissible or legitimate but not anti-communism?" Of course Draper's inability or unwillingness to answer this question has caused him and his friends to give aid and comfort to the right despite their embracing liberal and/or socialist identities. But just in case he has forgotten: anti-Communism begat McCarthyism and is always a primary ingredient of fascism. Draper has been fighting a lonely—and seemingly losing—battle against an increasing number of scholars who piece by piece have been reassessing the history of the American Communist Party. However, when Draper accuses these new historians of "only nibbling at the edges" of his general interpretation, however, he has a point. For whatever the value of these essays, none of the "new historians" has tackled a history of the Communist Party which would replace the work of Draper and his protégé Harvey Klehr.[18] Nonetheless, the publication of this admirable book makes that eventuality much closer.

NOTES

1. Theodore Draper, *The Roots of American Communism* (New York: Viking Press, 1957); and, *American Communism and Soviet Russia: The Formative Period* (New York: Viking Press, 1960). Irving Howe and Lewis Coser, *The American Communist Party: A Critical History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957).
2. Simon W. Gerson, *Pete: The Story of Peter V. Cacchione New York's First Communist Councilman* (New York: International Publishers, 1976). Benjamin J. Davis, *Communist Councilman from Harlem: Autobiographical Notes Written in a Federal Penitentiary* (New York: International Publishers, 1991). Gil Green, *Cold War Fugitive: A Personal Story of the McCarthy Years* (New York: International Publishers, 1984).
3. See for example: Alan Adelson, *SDS: A Profile* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1972), pp. 139-41. Christopher Lasch, *The Agony of the American Left* (New York: Vintage Book, 1969), pp. 211-12.
4. See also Peggy Dennis, *The Autobiography of an American Communist: A Personal View of a Political Life* (Berkeley, CA: Creative Arts Books, 1977). Dorothy Healey and Maurice Isserman, *Dorothy Healey Remembers: A Life in the American Communist Party* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). George Charney, *A Long Journey* (New York: Quadrangle Press, 1972). For the perspective of a rank and filer see Nell Irvin Painter, *The Narrative of Hosea Hudson* (Cambridge: University of Harvard Press, 1979).
5. See also Maurice Isserman, *Which Side Are You On?: The American Communist Party During the Second World War* (Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1982). Joshua Freeman, *In Transit: The Transport Workers Union in New York City: 1933-1966* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).
6. The new social history merges sociology with history in ways that bring it close to historical materialism. Here the masses are making history, and the leaders are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distant and reactive. The categories of class and class struggle are prominent. Unlike historical materialism, however, social history is very concerned with informal groups and sees culture as a more decisive, almost autonomous, force.

7. See for example: Phillip Lyons, *Philadelphia Communists, 1936-1956* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982). Vivian Gornick, *The Romance of American Communism* (New York: Basic Books, 1977).
8. See also: James Pickett, "Communists and the Communist Issue in the American Labor Movement, 1920-1950" (Ph.D. dissertation: University of California, 1975).
9. See, Mark Naison, *Communists in Harlem During the Depression* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1983).
10. See, Gerald Meyer, *Vito Marcantonio: Radical Politician, 1902-1912* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989).
11. The Party's achievements in this area were much broader than this, but this topic has yet to find its historian.
12. See, Gerald Horne, *Black and Red: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Afro-American Responses to the Cold War, 1944-1963* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1986).
13. See, Alan Wald, *The Responsibility of Intellectuals: Selected Essays on Marxist Traditions in Cultural Commitment* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, 1992).
14. See, Annette Rubinstein, *The Great Tradition in English Literature* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969).
15. Ellen Shrecher, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986). A very large literature has developed about the McCarthy era. See for example: David Caute, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge under Truman and Eisenhower* (New York: Touchstone, 1979). Victor Navasky, *Naming Names* (New York: Viking, 1980).
16. See, Joseph Starobin, *American Communism in Crisis, 1943-1957* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1975).
17. See also Draper's earlier articles also published in the *New York Review of Books* (May 9, 1985) and (May 30, 1985).
18. Harvey Klehr, *The Heyday of American Communism: The Depression Decade* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

Evil is not merely external, but external evils are many, and some societies are far more productive of them than others.—F. O. Matthiessen

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW FROM MONTHLY REVIEW PRESS

SOCIAL STRUGGLES AND THE CITY THE CASE OF SAO PAULO

EDITED BY LUCIO KOWARICK
Introduction by William W. Goldsmith

At a time when urban metropolitan areas are growing rapidly throughout the third world, **Social Struggles and the City** provides valuable insights into the dynamics of social and economic change in a large urban metropolis and shows the potentialities and limits of organized participatory action by the urban poor. The contrbutors are academics who also have first-hand knowledge of these struggles as organizers, party militants, and advisors to unions, neighborhoods, and the socialist city government.

Lúcio Kowarick is chair of the political science department of the University of São Paulo and was formerly the director of the Center for the Contemporary Culture.

William W. Goldsmith is director of the Program in International Studies in Planning at Cornell University and has written extensively on third world urbanization.

$18.00 PB8634 paper ($2.00 P & H)
272 pp./maps

Monthly Review Press
122 West 27th Street, New York, NY 10001

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from inside front cover.)

ism working itself out before our very eyes. An industry in which the ownership of capital and the control of production up to now has been pretty much scattered among many physicians and local non-profit boards (for the most part dominated by the local ruling class in each area) will soon become as highly concentrated and oligopolized as most commodity-producing industries already are.

The likely consequences of this transformation for the mass of health-care consumers, and also for those providers who have always prided themselves on their independence, will surely be far-reaching and mostly negative. The reason is simple: *medical* decisions will increasingly be made on non-medical, financial grounds. This is already happening, and it is bound to become more common. Even if you can choose your own doctor (most people can't), he/she will not be able to choose the treatment deemed best for you.

Is there any chance that this disastrous trend can be checked? A year or so ago the answer would have been yes, provided the Clinton administration had been prepared to get behind a single-payer system which, as we have earlier argued in this space, would have had a good chance of being adopted with that kind of support. The features of single payer that are crucial in this connection are that it eliminates private insurance from health care and, in so doing, as the Canadian experience shows, protects the independence of individual and small-scale providers. Clinton of course rejected this course and instead opted for a plan that actually promotes the trend towards concentration. This, in fact, is no small part of the reason why that process has been moving so rapidly.

In these circumstances, it would hardly be realistic to have high hopes for single payer in the near future. But the idea is sound and proven and must be kept alive as a fallback if the present political struggle in Washington among bad policy proposals becomes deadlocked, or later on when whichever one of them wins out, fails to deliver the real health-care reform the people need and want. It may well be a long and bitter fight, and it is very important that clear-headed people should understand what the issues are, take a stand in the people's interest, and stick to it through thick and thin. Now, therefore, is not time to give up on single payer but to redouble efforts to popularize its advantages, indeed, its necessity, not only for the mass of health-care consumers but also for the great majority of health-care providers who are in such danger of losing their precious independence.

If you agree, we want to recommend to you in strongest terms the book recently published by Monthly Review Press—*Dangerous to Your Health: Capitalism in Health Care*, by Johns Hopkins School of Public Health professor Vicente Navarro—which was designed and written precisely for this purpose. We ask you not only to buy and read the book yourself but to make yourself its salesperson: tell your friends, make sure your local bookstore(s) stocks it (this is especially important), recommend it to your college or community library. At $10 a copy it is the kind of book bargain you rarely see these days. If you order by mail, include $3 handling and postage for the first copy and 50 cents for each additional copy.

Bill Hinton has called our attention to two typos in his piece "Mao, Rural Development, and Two-Line Struggle" in the February issue of MR. On p. 9, in the first sentence of the last paragraph, "other" should read "of the." And on p. 5, line 5, "ration" should read "ratio."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Re- Reading the Postwar Period

An Intellectual Itinerary

Samir Amin

Since the 1960s, economist Samir Amin's work has been a major challenge to the "Eurocentric" viewpoint of the dominant academic thinking. In this fascinating volume, he re-examines his views in light of recent historic changes in global political and economic structures.

$14.00 PB8944 paper/192 pp.
($3.00 P & H)

Monthly Review Press

122 West 27th Street
New York, NY 10001
(212) 691-2555

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED